ROUMANIA
TEN YEARS AFTER

2 —

Roumania
Ten Years After

LIBRARY OF
Rochester Theological Seminary
DR 265
R6
1928
20860

THE BEACON PRESS, Inc.
25 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

Copyright, 1928
THE BEACON PRESS, INC.
All Rights Reserved

Printed in the United States of America

THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF RELIGIOUS MINORITIES

Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, D.D.
Dr. Clifford W. Barnes
Rev. Sylvester W. Beach, D.D.
Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.
Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D., LL.D.
Professor Philip Marshall Brown
Hon. Arthur Capper
Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, D.D.
Rev. Louis C. Cornish, D.D.
The Most Rev. Michael J. Curley, D.D.
Hon. Victor J. Dowling, LL.D.
Rev. Samuel A. Eliot, D.D.
Hon. Abram I. Elkus, LL.D.
Pres. W. H. P. Faunce, D.D. LL.D.
Hon. John H. Finley, LL.D.
Pres. Frank J. Goodnow, LL.D
Mr. Linley V. Gordon
Pres. Hamilton Holt, LL.D.
Hon. Herbert C. Hoover, LL.D.
Hon. Morton D. Hull
Mr. Otto H. Kahn
Rev. Frederick H. Knubel, D.D.
Hon. Robert Lansing, LL.D.
Rev. John Howland Lathrop, D.D.
Rev. Albert G. Lawson, D.D.
Mr. Ivy L. Lee
Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D.
Bishop William F. McDowell, D.D.
Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, D.D. LL.D.
Hon. Julian Mack
Hon. Theodore Marburg
Hon. Louis Marshall, LL.D.
Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.
Hon. David Hunter Miller
Rev. Kenneth D. Miller
Mr. John F. Moors
Rev. John A. Morehead, D.D.
Hon. Henry Morgenthau, LL.D.
Mr. Adolph S. Ochs
Mr. George A. Plimpton, LL.D.
Hon. Frank Lyon Polk
Mr. Bernard G. Richards
Very Rev. Howard C. Robbins, D.D.
Rev. Charles E. Schaeffer, D.D.
Rt. Rev. Joseph Schrembs, D.D.
Professor James Brown Scott
Dr. Albert Shaw
Mr. Carl Sherman
Mr. Fred B. Smith
Rev. George Stewart, D.D.
Hon. William Howard Taft, LL.D.
Rev. Worth M. Tippy, D.D.
Mr. Fennell P. Turner
Dr. James J. Walsh
Mr. Schuyler N. Warren, Jr.
Hon. George W. Wickersham, LL.D.
Bishop Luther B. Wilson, D.D., LL.D.
Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, D.D.

The members of the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities assume no personal responsibility for the following statements. The Commission was appointed by the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities and presents this report to all the members of the Committee and to the public.

FOREWORD

At a meeting of the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities held in New York City on April 7, 1927, it was voted to send a commission to visit the Kingdom of Roumania during the summer of 1927 to investigate the condition of the racial and religious minorities embraced within greater Roumania. A similar commission had been sent by this committee in the summer of 1925, but this commission had confined its attention entirely to the minorities in Transylvania. It was felt, therefore, that a study of the minorities within the old kingdom, principally the Jewish and Baptist and the minorities of Bessarabia, Bukovina, Maramuresh and the Banat similar to that made of Transylvania and a survey of such changes as may have taken place in the last two years in Transylvania, should be made.

Dr. Henry A. Atkinson of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, was appointed chairman of the commission. Rev. R. A. McGowan of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Dr. John Howland Lathrop, a Unitarian minister of New York, Dr. Graham Hunter, a Presbyterian minister of Fullerton, Calif., and Monsieur Jules Jezequel, the Paris representative of the Church Peace Union, constituted the commission.

We arrived in Bucharest June 12, and the last member of the commission left Roumania the last week in July. We were courteously received by the heads of the

various departments of the Roumanian government and assured that our visit was welcomed by them, since they desired the truth to be known in America concerning Roumania, and felt that that truth, when uncovered by us, would enhance the reputation of Roumania. The use of a government car was offered us and this generous offer was accepted for the first ten days of our travels with the understanding that we should be privileged to make our investigations unescorted by any government official. However, an official was appointed to accompany us but in spite of this fact we were able to carry out our interviews in private. For the remainder of our trip we hired automobiles and travelled unescorted, having been furnished by the government with letters to the civil and military authorities. We engaged for a portion of our travels, where the Magyar language was spoken, two interpreters. In all other sections of the country we found English, French and German sufficient.

Our method was to interview in all cities and villages visited, the clergy, Jewish, Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant alike, the editors of the newspapers, school teachers, lawyers, and such citizens as we were able. Dr. Atkinson was obliged to leave the commission before the visit to Transylvania, the Maramuresh and the Banat, and Dr. Lathrop acted as chairman. We returned to Bucharest after visiting Moladvia, Bessarabia and Bukovina, and made a brief report to the government, and two members of the commission, Father McGowan and Dr. Hunter, returned to Bucharest at the end of our investigation, making a brief official report.

In submitting this report to the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities, we have made no attempt to list specific instances of abuses of the rights of minorities, as was done by the former commission. We have deemed it wise this time to use such instances purely as illustrative material and to deal in this report rather with the general policies and attitudes of the Roumanian government. More important than the correction of any single abuse is needed, it seems to us, a radical change on the part of the government in its policies in dealing with the minorities.

It is our hope that this report may prove not only informative to the committee which sent us, but also of constructive suggestion to the Roumanian government when it has had an opportunity to see how the situation looks to outside and unprejudiced persons.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	FOREWORD.	v
I.	THE BACKGROUND.	1
II.	THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM.	13
III.	THE PSYCHOLOGY OF FEAR.	20
IV.	ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA.	29
V.	THE GOVERNMENTAL ATTITUDE AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW.	34
VI.	CITIZENSHIP.	39
VII.	THE SCHOOLS.	48
VIII.	THE CHURCHES.	90
IX.	CONCLUSIONS.	108
	APPENDIX. THROUGH FRENCH EYES.	119

Roumania Ten Years After

Chapter I

THE BACKGROUND

BEFORE the war, Roumania was a small nation with a crescent shaped territory less in area than England and Wales and a population of little more than 6,500,000. By the victory of the Allies, her territory was increased to more than twice its former area and her population by almost three to one, compared to the years before 1914. Her crescent in the ascendent has become a full moon, for her territory now forms an almost perfect circle.

Of the new provinces added to the kingdom, Transylvania and the Banat were Hungarian; Bukovina, Austrian; Bessarabia, Russian and certain areas in the Dobrudja, Bulgarian. This latter territory came to her from successive wars and agreements with the Powers, with small additional land added after the Great War.

Living in these acquired provinces the majority of the people are Roumanians, but mixed with them are large numbers of other races—men and women speaking different tongues and clinging tenaciously to the old culture in which they have grown up. In Transylvania, there is a large and powerful minority composed of Hungarians who, by reason of cultural privileges granted under the old regime and the prerogatives they assumed because of wealth and titles, took up and maintained an attitude of

contempt for the rank and file of the people of the land— the Roumanians— whom they forced to become Hungarians or allowed to remain illiterate. To the lords of the land, the Roumanians were the "hewers of wood and drawers of water."

Zsombor de Szász, in his recent book *The Minorities of Roumanian Transylvania* says: "Transylvania was composed of four elements, the Hungarians and the Szekelys who were racially akin to each other, the Saxon colonists, and the Roumanian intruders. The situation and the legal status of these four peoples were very different. The Hungarians and the Szekelys, both of the conquering race, and the Saxons formed the substratum, the foundation, of the political life and constitutional government of the country. The former two peoples, the Hungarians and the Szekelys, were the free nobles, the latter, the Saxons, the free burghers." The others were nearly all Roumanians and they, together with the landless Hungarians, were the serfs, without rights or privileges. Of the serfs, Szász says, "they could be enobled and thus enter the ranks of the Hungarian nobility."

If under the old regime, Hungary defended her right to control with an iron hand this majority and grant privileges only on condition that they become Hungarians, surely there can be no serious quarrel with the majority for assuming such a right in regard to this minority. They being citizens of Roumania, however, are entitled to all the privileges and benefits granted to other citizens, no more and no less can be tolerated.

The question then is one not of a higher or lower culture, not one that can be determined by reference to his-

torical facts which can never be proved or stated in such a manner as to win universal approval. It is a question of human rights. Having become a part of the Roumanian Kingdom, are the members of the minority races receiving fair and just treatment? That is the question.

Besides the Hungarian minority, there are about 1,000,000 Saxons and other Germans scattered throughout Roumania. In Bukovina there are a large number of Ukrainians mostly dwellers on the land, while in Bessarabia, the peasants are Roumanians, and the city dwellers Russians. For instance, in Chishinau, Russian is heard almost exclusively in the streets, while in the public market places, the common tongue is Roumanian. And on the other hand, in Cernauti, the capital of Bukovina, the common languages heard in the streets are German, Roumanian, Yiddish, but in the market, all the people speak Ukrainian and only Ukrainian. The Dobrudja is, especially in the West, largely Bulgarian.

The Jews number under a million in greater Roumania. In the old kingdom, there were approximately 300,000 Jews, so that those who have come into the kingdom since the war form a large and important addition to the life of the nation. Under the old rule in Russia and Roumania, the Jew was not allowed to live outside of the cities and towns. He had no political or social privileges. Even now all the Jews are found in the cities. In some places they make up at least fifty per cent of the population. For the most part they are poor, but the few wealthy ones among them are so rich that after all there is a considerable part of the wealth and the industry of the country held in Jewish hands.

As to the population within greater Roumania, we find that of the 17,000,000 inhabitants of the country, about 5,000,000 belong to minority groups and more than 6,000,000 others who were brought under the Roumanian flag, while speaking the language of the country, have been for generations subjects of another civilization and a different type of culture and therefore their desire to be a part of greater Roumania is not as strong as the desire of the old Roumanian ruling class to have them as a part of the new and powerful kingdom that is in the making.

The task then of this government is to unify the people, to weld together all of these divergent groups with their different types of culture and varied interests, and instill into them a love and appreciation for Roumania, its king, and its flag. It is only fifty years since Roumania came out from under Turkish rule and became an independent nation. During that period she has had to struggle against difficulties both within and without. The first rulers under the new regime, members of powerful families, raised the jealousy of other important factions and it was the Bratianus, forbears of the present "Man of Affairs" in Roumania, who called in the Hohenzollerns and established them upon the throne. The traditions of the country are Byzantine and the "force politic" is the argument best known to them in all crises. It carried them through the first forty years of their existence, then came the war and now in ruling over the enlarged territory this method is by far the one most popular.

The people of Roumania are kindly, industrious, contented. The peasants are as sturdy a people as one can

find anywhere in the world. But having grown up in the traditions of the East, there has not been much ambition aroused in them to better their condition. The few who have been stirred with the desire to get on in the world, unless they happen to be members of the families of the ruling class, have sought their fortunes outside of the borders of Roumania. Only a small proportion of the people are literate, even in old Roumania. In planning in 1924 the reform of the educational system and providing schools for all the people, Angelescu, the Secretary of Education, admitted that sixty-seven per cent of the Roumanian people in the old kingdom could neither write nor read. The new plan, whereby every boy and girl will have the opportunity to become literate is an ambitious scheme showing that the nation recognizes that education is fundamental to the success of its plans. The task it has on its hands is a difficult one for Roumania—how can the nation solidify its territory, unify its government, secure the allegiance of its people, and develop a strong economic and political existence.

In order to do this, it must develop its own leadership. At the present time one of the greatest difficulties arises from the fact that there is no body of Roumanian citizenship from which the nation can draw its leaders and it is impossible to get men adequately equipped to take even subordinate positions. The prefects of police throughout the country are for the most part incompetent or are often men taken from the minority groups. The same is true of the teachers. It is with great difficulty that the school boards can find Roumanians competent to teach. The nation is setting about its task of creating a new citizenship

and developing a leadership adequate to the demands. The reform in the school laws, the development of the high school and university system, the new attention that is being paid to the educational needs, the emoluments that are offered to public servants—all of these things are having their effect. In addition to the necessity for creating a Roumanian middle class, there is another heavy task occasioned by the military and economic necessities of the country. For instance, it is necessary to turn the railroads and make Bucharest their radiating center. Under the Austrian regime, the principal lines out of Cernauti led to Vienna, the lines from Chishinau led directly to Moscow, the lines from Cluj went directly to Budapest. Roumania is working to make Bucharest the terminus of all the railroads in its attempt to centralize power in the capital of the country. This is the old world method and every nation is considered strong just in proportion as it is able to establish railway lines from its capital to its borders and keep them open and in operation. The minorities find grounds for complaint in this attempt on the part of the government, and Roumanians themselves living outside Bucharest question the procedure. Instead of a highly centralized government, the powerful National Peasants' Party opposed to this policy of the Liberal Party contend that it would be wiser to de-centralize by giving greater prestige to the principal cities in the various provinces. Considering the practice in the surrounding countries and the general theory of protective government in Europe, it is hardly likely that Roumania would set an example of such ideal action in this matter.

Practically every question, then, involving the minorities, has to do with Roumania's conception of the problem of self preservation. The administration of law is considered first from the standpoint of the good of Roumania and second from the rights of the individual. The school system is frankly established for the development of servants of the state, not primarily for the development of the individual. The judiciary of the country is being recognized more and more as the strong background of the central government. The agrarian reforms were put into operation because, only through them could the nation be made secure against the dangers arising from time to time out of the peasant revolts. The churches are looked upon as a part of the government. The patriarch of the Eastern Church stands second or third in the kingdom and now, under the regency, his position is one of even greater strength and commanding importance. To be a member of any other church in Roumania except the established Eastern Orthodox Church is to put oneself under suspicion of lack of loyalty. Baptists and the little sect of the Adventists are bitterly persecuted because they are looked upon as in a sense disloyal to the state. If their numbers corresponded to the numbers of the Jews or of the Hungarians, their sufferings would be recognized as constituting the basis of an appeal to the world against a tyranny unmatched in modern times. As it is, they are few in number, they are simple folk, and the difficulties under which they live are not considered very seriously by the outside world. In them we find the only case perhaps in the whole of Europe of persecu-

tion based purely on religious principles. They constitute a real religious minority.

Another factor that must be considered as a part of the background of the situation in Roumania is the prevalent attitude of the politicians and political parties and their methods of conducting affairs. In no western country would it be possible for a government to fall when parliament was not in session, yet this is what happened in the summer of 1927. The Averescu government fell and a government was set up with Prince Stirbey as Prime Minister. This was to be merely a nominal government and the people of the country were told that for the first time in the history of Roumania there would be a free and honest election. Everybody was elated. Representatives of the National Peasants' Party felt that at last they were to receive consideration in proportion to their strength. But as the election proceeded and it became apparent that the National Peasants' Party would poll a large vote and it was even thought possible that it might name the next government, the Liberal Party, under the leadership of Bratianu, brought about the downfall of Stirbey and had a new government set up with Bratianu himself as Prime Minister and a full cabinet named. The word was then sent out through the country that the same old methods which had always prevailed would be put in operation in the present election. This was done. Tickets permitting to vote were issued only to those who would vote for the Liberal candidates. From the standpoint of the politicians all this was done in the interests of greater Roumania and for the good of the people. The clashes which occurred at various points indicated that the political forces

of the country had stirred up antagonisms and angered many of those who ought to be conciliated that their influence might be utilized in carrying out the purposes and ideals of the nation.

The Jews come into the situation in Roumania in various ways. Under the old regime, these people had no rights at all, under the constitution they were guaranteed the same rights as other citizens and in 1920 they were granted the full privileges of citizenship. Located as Roumania is and after having absorbed Bessarabia and Bukovina with their large Jewish populations, the "new Jews," as they are called, form a considerable element in the life, especially of those provinces along the new Russian border. They are being made, in a measure, scapegoats. Whatever goes wrong, the Jew is blamed. Roumania depends largely upon outside nations such as England and France for capital to maintain her industries. She cannot live without moral and financial credit. The Jew is considered a malcontent and as such is charged with attempting to influence banks, bankers, and international financiers against the country. It is he who is charged with the failure of the nation to secure loans for the stabilization of the leu. Whether the charges are true or not does not matter. They make a good stick with which to beat the Jew. The other minorities have a national background against which their grievances are made plain to the rest of the world. A crime against the Hungarians is cried aloud in Budapest. Vienna and Berlin echo to the calls for help from the German-speaking minorities. Moscow takes cognizance of what is done against the Russians. Sofia is vitally interested in her nationals

now living in the Dobrudja. But the Jew has no nation to which he can appeal. He is a man without a country. He lives in Roumania at the mercy of the nation and subject to whatever treatment his neighbors care to visit upon him. When, considering himself a minority, he asks for relief from an international organization he is told that he is not a minority, that his only citizenship is in Roumania. When, on the other hand, he asks for rights and privileges, he is told that he is a Jew and a member of the minority group and can secure those privileges only on the basis agreed upon with the other minorities. Thus he is subjected to ill will, to bad fortune, and to mistreatment from every direction. Any excuse, however flimsy it may be, is excuse enough to make him the object of persecution. In the constitution, great liberty was guaranteed to the Jew, but these liberties have not been wholly granted. There is always the discrepancy between the intentions of the law and the constitution, and the power and the will to make them effective.

The Jew himself has not been slow in seeing the opportunities in this situation and while it does not excuse the government for allowing the things that have been done, it does make clear the difficulty. The Jew, living as he does in the "Shadow Zone" between the status of a minority and that of a true Roumanian citizen, has, in many instances, done exactly what the government has done. He has claimed minority rights when it has suited him and, on the other hand, has claimed that he is and always has been a Roumanian citizen and if he has come into the nation since the war, he came in not as a member of a minority group but as an individual, becoming a citi-

zen of his own free will and by the terms of the treaties. This has complicated the situation and makes it more difficult. The government claims that it is impossible to lend protection to the Jew. That there never has been a "pogrom" in the history of Roumania is the proud boast of all its people. The people are singularly free from race hatred and it is difficult to arouse their passions against any group of individuals because they happen to be different from the rank and file of their neighbors. But when the government excuses its failure to protect on the ground of weakness, one remembers the strength with which it has destroyed Communism and the vigor with which it has put down every insurrection and even today keeps the long border between Russia and Roumania tightly closed.

One final factor enters into this picture of the background and that is the fall of the currency. Like most European nations at the end of the war, Roumania found herself with impaired credit and with her currency dropping constantly to lower levels. The uncertainty in the market and the speculation upon its money, has led to still greater instability. This instability has tended to lower the value of the leu and this in turn has led to more instability, so that, at the present time, the nation finds itself, as far as its finances are concerned, in a vicious circle. How will it be possible to break through this circle—that is the pressing question.

Roumania has much to commend her. Her country is productive, her location is advantageous lying as she does in the very heart of south-eastern Europe. She has valuable ports, good communication with the rest of the

world, and an inherently intelligent citizenship. She needs friends, money, credit, and publicity of the right sort. Her problems are so vital to the welfare of her own citizens and to those millions who have been committed to her care that the rest of the world will scrutinize her every act. While her friends may explain and make allowances for things done, nevertheless, Roumania faces the world today as a nation whose future will depend more than that of any other nation, upon the justice with which she treats the minority groups. If Roumania can find a solution for this question, she will not only be able to assure her own future and confer an inestimable benefit upon the people committed to her, but will bring the entire world under obligation to her for having worked out a method of dealing with the most difficult problem that has vexed organized governments.

Chapter II

THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM

ROUMANIA'S economic system is state capitalism imposed upon a backward but very rich agricultural and timber country, which has lately undertaken the development of its oil resources and factories. This state capitalism is modified by extensive though inadequate peasants' cooperation, supervised, however, by the state.

A group of political business men reap the chief benefits. This group, headed by the Bratianu family, is composed of the pre-war ruling political class of old Roumania, slightly augmented. Their traditional business is banking.

This system began before the war. One hundred years ago Roumania was a static, agricultural, lord and serf society ruled politically by Constantinopolitan Greeks representing Turkey. The opening of the Danube to Roumanian grain (at England's behest) marked the turning point. Roumanian lords sold their grain for money in the world market, bought western goods, travelled, lived in lordly fashion and borrowed money. This new trade in agricultural products wrecked the servile labor system, unsatisfactory now to the lords themselves. Aided by the rivalry of the Powers and the new western ideas, it also induced political sovereignty, and taught the magic of banking and credit. The traders and bankers, however, were not Roumanians but Jews or other foreigners often representing money domiciled in England and Hungary.

Two national classes began to struggle for power; one, the lords, the other, the new "liberal" "men-on-the-make," sons of the former Greek official class, of the Orthodox priests, of the professional men, and of the lesser landlord class, who sought political power from the lords and at the same time, the new power of credit from foreigners and Jews. The lords saw themselves fighting a losing battle against the new commercialism. Many became parasitical absentees. Peasants lay powerless and oppressed. But it was not Roumanians, nor even, to their dismay, the native "men-on-the-make" who were agents of the new rising power of trade and the greater power of credit.

With the situation thus, the "men-on-the-make," marking the second turning point in Roumanian history, cut across the system. Led by the elder Jon Bratianu, who had earlier distinguished himself by engineering a parlor revolution against a native prince of the rival landlord class, they created a bank of their own, the National Bank, in majority partnership with the government. The National Bank was a bank of issue, a government depository, a government financial agent and an investment bank. The "men-on-the-make" had the inside hold on the credit power of the government. They were now in a position to compete with the foreigners and Jews and to grow steadily in wealth while the lords declined. Yet, state capitalism before the war was timid compared with what it is now. The landlord class was still strong. German guidance and competition were omnipresent. Poor in industries and a country of absentee landlords and landless farm tenants and laborers, Roumania offered meager opportunities for banking and investment.

It remained for the Greater Roumania of the peace treaties and the concession scrambling, currency inflation, land revolution, post-war years to give Roumanian state capitalism tropical growth. German suzerainty and banking competition were gone. Territory and population were doubled. Landlordism was crushed and agricultural Roumania was under peasant proprietors. The oil industry was to be reorganized. Foreign concessionaires besieged government departments. Parts of the new provinces were highly industrialized and ownership of these industries, in the shift of boundaries was now largely foreign or, when not foreign, was in the hands of the new minority subjects.

In old Roumania, trade, industry, and part of the banking was Jewish or foreign, while agriculture, politics, and part of the banking was Roumanian of non-Jewish stock. In the new provinces, the Roumanians were still weaker in business life; they were mostly landless peasants or city laborers. With the break up of the estates, the landlords were impoverished by the compulsory sale for a pittance of most of their land, and agriculture as a source of large income almost disappeared. Yet, if they could only seize them, a multitude of banking, industrial, and trade opportunities, and a host of government positions were opened up for the "men-on-the-make" and for the dispossessed landlords and their sons. But while they might hold the government positions, they were unacquainted with the active direction of business and were for the most part poor. The Golden Age threatened to be the heritage, not of the dominant racial group of the country, but of minorities and foreigners. It threatened to be so

even though the National Bank was controlled by representatives of the dominant racial group. For them to win, they must use to the utmost the power of government which the earlier "men-on-the-make" had harnessed before the war.

The use of the government for business opportunities, and as a source of income in other ways, characterizes the new Roumania. The government is the goose that lays the golden egg. Backward peasants, satisfied temporarily with land though silently working forward to a probably dominant position in the future, can be placated. The new minorities are strangers in a strange land and were themselves economic provincials in their old empires. The battle rages elsewhere and on two fields. First, between the Roumanians of Roumanian stock, on the one hand, and the Jews, particularly of old Roumania, the other minorities, and the foreigners, on the other. Second, between one group of Roumanians and the Roumanians of the new provinces especially of old Hungary, whose ambitions were high but who did not belong to the ruling Bratianu political-business group of Bucharest.

Control of the government is essential; how control is kept is recounted elsewhere. Here only the political methods of obtaining business opportunities, position, and income are recounted. The center of the power is the National Bank which has close to fifty branches throughout the country. This bank is owned one-third by the government and two-thirds by private individuals. As a bank of issue and the chief government depository and financial agent, it has great strength and, in addition, great influence over the remaining banking business of

the country. Formerly it had wide rein in the character of its loans and investments, being able to purchase securities of industrial corporations. The government exercises close supervision over it, takes its share of the profits, and has a special claim on surplus profits. Only Roumanian subjects or "naturalized" companies are to hold stock after 1930 and only Roumanian subjects are to have voting power in stockholders' meetings. Its competitors are Jewish banks, foreign banks, and banks of the Christian minorities.

Since 1924, when the National Bank was being reorganized, there has existed also a National Society of Industrial Credit, of which twenty per cent of the stock belongs to the government and thirty per cent to the National Bank. Its bonds and interest are state-guaranteed. Profits have been enormous. Again the partnership of the government and the National Bank is to be noted.

In limited liability companies, one-third of the Board of Directors must be Roumanian subjects. If rural property is to be dealt in by the corporation, one more than one-half of the directors must be Roumanian.

Oil is treated separately. Existing companies are temporarily exempt though pressure is applied to have them become Roumanian corporations. The aim is to put oil under the ownership or control of Roumanian subjects; sixty per cent of the stock of all future companies must be held by Roumanian subjects and fifty-five per cent of the stock of existing companies must be so held. Sale of stock, except from one Roumanian to another, can not be made save by consent of the Board of Administration. Foreign

companies wishing to be "nationalized," that is, put in the hands of Roumanians, must have a majority of the directors and the executive committee and the chairman Roumanian.

Secretaries of chambers of commerce are quasi-government agents. They are appointed by the government and the chambers are given a political status and are government regulated.

The State exercises a monopoly over tobacco, cigarette papers, salt, matches, playing cards, and explosives. It owns the telegraph and telephone systems as well as the postal system. It owns or directs the railroads. It gains an income from maritime and river navigation, from iron and other works, from coal, gas, and forests.

Its tariff system is very elaborate. There are both import and export tariffs. Many goods are prohibited from either import or export and other goods are temporarily in one or the other class. A tariff board is in immediate charge of changes in the tariff.

Under a very highly centralized government, such powers as these are incalculable. In the hands of men fired with the desire both to catch up with the business systems, standards, and strength of western capitalists, and to get control of the internal economic systems, such powers of government tell their own story.

Business opportunities, stock ownership and directorship are manufactured for the men in the government and in the National Bank and investment company, and for their political friends. Those who do not thus share may aspire to employment in the active and highly central-

ized government, perhaps in the government industries or the government offices or the school system or the health department or the army or the police force.

Indeed, only a minority of the Roumanians of the Golden Age can aspire to directorship and investment. For the great masses of them, outside of the peasants and the owners of estates of moderate size, government employment and the independent practice of professions become the sole sources of income and status. Roumanians of Roumanian stock have not been trained in trade, they still look down upon it and since others have long been established in this occupation it is very difficult to break into it.

State capitalism becomes, therefore, the logical economic system for a Roumania that wishes to grow as a business country and for Roumanians who wish to become the beneficiaries. It is the more urgent because the sons of the former lords and the great numbers turned out of the higher schools need employment and dignities and a spur to their ambition for themselves and the new nation. The difficulty, of course, is that the government shakes its business and political plums into the laps only of its friends and its friends are not the Jews nor the new minorities nor the new Roumanians of Transylvania, the Banat, the Maramuresh, Bukovina, or Bessarabia. Its friends are the Bratianu group of old Roumania, augmented by a few of the lords, a few old Roumanians who have risen to position in recent years, and a select few from the new provinces.

Chapter III

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF FEAR

MANY of the injustices from which the minorities of Roumania suffer can be directly traced to the psychology of fear. This statement is probably best illustrated in the anti-Semitic movement. The Jew has always been a convenient object toward which to divert public attention at any time that the government felt that its own policies and procedure were coming up for criticism. It was reported to us that the father of Premier Bratianu, to whom the beginning of the anti-Semitic movement in Roumania may be attributed, was primarily influenced by his desire to divert public attention. Nevertheless, since the war, with the accessions to the number of Jews in Roumania which resulted, a vague indefinable fear lest the Jew prove keener in competition than the Roumanian himself and might ultimately succeed in gaining actual control of the country is very evident. The very title of Professor Cuza's political party, "The Christian Defense League," implies this fear, and while this party is small in numbers, it is relatively large, with inarticulate sympathizers, and the common belief among the Roumanian people, expressed to us many times, that the Jews are rich, can have no other basis in fact than this fear. In one city where there are in the neighborhood of 50,000 Jews residing, we discovered that while there may be from 400 to 500 that are well-to-do and a few of them wealthy, the rest are in abject poverty such as it is difficult to describe. We went through street after street

and into the miserable hovels which displayed to the eye the misery and poverty of at least 49,500 of the Jewish inhabitants, many of whom are kept alive only by relief from America and the contributions which the men of the families, who have been able to migrate to other countries, are able to send home to their women and children. We talked with a group of university students who were in no way allied with the anti-Semitic movement and who professed to have no sympathy with it, but after a few moments of scratching beneath the surface, it became evident that their minds were filled with the usual suspicions of the Jew, and that these fears and suspicions were held with intense emotion.

The Jews in Roumania are of various sorts. The old Talmudic Jews, with their characteristic curls and dress, many of whom crossed the boundaries into what is now Roumania during and immediately following the war, from Russia, Poland, etc., are in the pathetic condition of homelessness. The Roumanians want them to get out of the country, but it is impossible for them to do this without passports and they cannot secure passports without Roumanian citizenship. Another class of Jews is made up of the petty merchants in small towns and villages and professional men, such as the country doctors and lawyers. In many instances these people have a pride of race which persuades the Roumanians that they are unassimilable, being primarily Jews and only secondarily citizens of the kingdom in which they reside. Their patriotism and loyalty is therefore questioned, and the Roumanian suspicion of them has given circulation to tales that are gross exaggerations and in many instances slanderous falsehoods.

Doubtless there were Jewish war profiteers and have been land profiteers since the agrarian reform, but there was no evidence that there was any peculiar proportion of such persons among the Jews. Another class of Jews are those who have lived in the old kingdom for many generations, who have become the distinguished bankers, lawyers, etc., in the larger cities, who are accepted as citizens of the kingdom, and who would if they could forget their racial stock.

The Roumanian people are themselves of two classes—the little group of bankers, industrialists, politicians and priests, and the vast mass of peasants on the land. It is the ardent and commendable desire of the Roumanians to develop a middle class of their own stock. In the old kingdom this brings them immediately face to face in competition with the Jews who have become the middle class, partly because of the law which prevented the Jew from acquiring land, thus encouraging what seemed to be his natural tendencies. The Roumanian fears the Jew as brighter, cleverer, smarter, and the anti-Semitic movement among the university students is directly traceable to this fear. Professor Cuza of the University of Jasi, who is the political leader of the Christian Defense League, is also the originator of the National Roumanian Christian Students' Union, an organization that may be called the very hot-bed of anti-Semitism. This Union has for its object, as among the things which their platform states, to drive the Jewish students from the university by methods of terrorism, and to drive the Jews from the Kingdom of Roumania, if possible. The Union instigates what are called "demonstrations," and the students of Jasi have

gone to the other universities to spread their movement there. The nature of a demonstration is somewhat as follows: When Jewish students appear for their classes or their examinations in such courses as require no attendance at lectures but only appearance at examinations at the end of the year, these students are met in the halls outside the lecture rooms and beaten up to the extent that they are often carried to the hospitals. After a few of the Jewish group have been thus handled, the remainder are sufficiently frightened to run away. An instance is cited in one of the Bucharest papers in which a professor remonstrated with his students and was himself assaulted by them. The morning on which we arrived in Bucharest "The Dimineata" for June 12 gave the following account of a demonstration which had just taken place:—

"New Riots at the Medical Faculty

"The aggressive scenes at the University have recommenced.

"Yesterday morning, Jewish students presented themselves to pass examination in physics, but were approached and beaten in a barbarous manner, just at the entrance to the room where the professor examined the candidates.

"The group of rowdies, lead by students Carp Silviu, Tchuria D., Teodorescu and Lutchescu, were not satisfied to illtreat only the male students, but threatened to beat also the female students, if they would not abstain from coming to pass their examinations.

"The Jewish students fled to the Doyen's entrance door, but there too they were followed by the aggressors and illtreated. They could not have escaped,

but for the intervention of Secretary Sautchanu who got them out from the university building through the backyard.

"Students Glanger Solomon, Leibovitch, Gross and others were also very badly beaten.

"The Jewish students have complained to the Doyen through the intermedium of Mr. Sautchanu, stating that if no measures are taken, they will not be able to appear at the examination and will lose the year, 'though they followed the lectures and paid the taxes.' "

We examined the files of the Bucharest papers and were shocked and astonished to discover the number of such demonstrations which had occurred from January 1 to the date of our arrival, June 12, 1927. In all fairness to the Roumanians, it must be stated that thirty-six members of the faculty of the University of Jasi drafted and sent to the Ministry of Education a fine and vigorous protest against this student movement for which their colleague, Professor Cuza, was responsible. It is not the Roumanians as a whole who are to be blamed, but it was the feeling of the Commission that had a government, which is able to be so effective in suppressing Communism and other movements in the country, been really desirous of doing so, they could have suppressed this movement long ago, and there is the danger lest what these students have originated may ultimately become disseminated and instigated among the people as a whole. Indications of such a danger are the enforced sale to the peasants throughout the country, at an absurdly high price through gendarmes, of an anti-Semitic volume written by Monsieur Goga, Minister of the Interior in the Averescu Gov-

ernment, the circulation of post-cards and posters calculated to inflame the minds of the people, and other literature. For instance, a paper in January 1927 represented the Jew chopping down the cross, with the caption "Go to Palestine." Jehovah of the Old Testament is represented as Satan, suggesting that the sacred book of the Jews is the inspiration of Satan. A frequent caption is "To Whom Does Roumania Belong—to the Roumanians or to the Sheenies?" The students have a hymn in which violent hatred of the Jews is expressed. Can such propaganda continue without the danger that in the end the people will be infected and the "pogrom," which the government boasts has never yet occurred within the kingdom, result? The actual student demonstrations themselves spill over into the community. The student group "goes wild," sometimes smashing windows of the synagogues or of the shops, and abusing older citizens on the street.

That such methods of terrorism have been effective is evident from the figures. University students in the four universities of Roumania live together in dormitories built by taxing the people as a whole. A Jewish student coming to a university discovers, however, that although his father has paid his taxes, he, as a Jew, is not permitted to live in these dormitories. The Jews, therefore, have to provide in addition, dormitories for their own students. Here one will see Jewish students congregated in large numbers, studying under the trees in the dormitory yard, and sleeping in the building. In the last five years the number of Jewish students registered in the various faculties has rapidly decreased. In Bucharest, where there is a student body of from 15,000 to 17,000 students, 1,500

to 1,800 Jewish students are registered. In the preparatory year of the Medical Faculty which has always had a large number of Jewish students, there were no Jews registered this year. In this faculty an excuse for anti-Semitism has been made of the inability of Jewish students to produce Jewish cadavers on which to work, but this is evidently an excuse only. There is more obligatory attendance upon the lectures and laboratories in the Medical School than in the Law School; hence, the law students have been less molested. In the University of Cluj in the Medical School, the percentage of Jews attending has dropped from thirty-seven per cent in 1921 to 5.66 per cent in 1926. Of 185 students enrolled in the first year Medical this year, only two were Jews.

Thus does the Roumanian's fear of the Jew breed the returning fear in the hearts of the Jews. Since 1922, December 10 has become the festive day for attacks on Jews in Universities, and last year the University of Bucharest considered it wise to close on this day. It will be interesting to watch for newspaper reports of what may happen any year on December 10. In seeking interviews with distinguished Jews, lawyers, rabbis, etc., throughout the country, a fear that amounted to real terror was evidenced in many instances.

The operation of the psychology of fear which is thus amply illustrated by the case of the Jews is equally evident in the treatment of other minorities. Among the religious minorities in the kingdom, the Baptists and the Adventists are the only ones with a definite policy of propaganda among the Roumanians themselves. In a country where the church has always been so closely iden-

tified with the state, as has the Eastern Orthodox Church, to convert from the state church to a sect seems like a process of breaking up the unity of the state and undermining it. Hence, the government is peculiarly afraid of the 34,000 Baptists, 22,000 of whom are Roumanians, who have already been converted within the kingdom, and orders are sent out to suppress this movement. The result is that petty officials acting under government orders devise their own means of persecuting the Baptists and these are often cruel. An instance was reported to us of gendarmes entering a Baptist church and ordering the congregation to march to the river, where the gendarmes kept them standing in water up to the waist for some four hours, forcing them to pray, sing and call on the Lord for help, and then marched them to another village to the gendarmerie, where the women were taken into the cellars, beaten and assaulted. Other instances of persecution might be cited, but it is not the particular offence that is of importance, rather the fear of a propagandist movement that instigates such behavior. Americans ask the question, "Why should not a movement have the right to convert or carry on a propaganda?" But to a Roumanian official such a question is almost incomprehensible, and the Baptists are, therefore, having a peculiarly hard struggle to obtain recognition which alone will put an end to their sufferings.

Your commission was travelling through Transylvania just preceding the last election. The operations of the psychology of fear were there most evident. As we ap-approached a Roumanian village in our automobile we seldom were stopped and saw little of gendarmes. In

Saxon villages we would encounter gendarmes usually in the public square, but in approaching Hungarian villages, there were invariably two gendarmes at the entrance to the town, two in the central square, and two as we left the town. This experience was an indication of the fact that where the likelihood of irredentism is greatest because of the proximity of the country to which the people might be reannexed, there the fear of the government is strongest. The tragic fact is that the methods which this fear prompts the government to pursue are the methods which irritate, annoy, and tend to produce the very irredentism which is feared.

Had it been our fortune to have been in Bessarabia during the period preceding the election, we have reason to believe that we would have seen similar indications of the fear of irredentism. The very strenuous efforts there to Roumanize a population which in the cities is almost wholly Russian or Jewish indicated the same attitude of the government towards this province. We found practically no indication of sympathy with Bolshevism among the Russian population, but natural love of the country with which the people are related racially, linguistically and culturally was evidently interpreted as sympathy with the present Bolshevist regime in Russia.

If these potent illustrations of racial, irredentist and other fears on the part of a government that is attempting to weld states of various peoples, traditions and cultures into a Kingdom, are born in mind some light may be thrown on the whole question of the treatment of minorities dealt with in this report.

Chapter IV

ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA

FREQUENTLY throughout Roumania, one sees painted on walls or buildings the swastika. This is the sign of Roumanian anti-Semitism and with the words above it "Christ-King-Country" and below it the signature "A. C. Cuza" it is the official emblem of the chief anti-Semitic organization, "The League for National Christian Defense." The swastika alone without motto or signature is, however, the customary emblem and it is as revealing as the initials K.K.K. or I.W.W. in the United States. It is intended to symbolize both Arian blood and Christian faith.

Anti-Jewish propaganda in Roumania is centered in two organizations, the above-named League and the student organization, "The National Roumanian Christian Students Union" referred to in the preceding section. A. C. Cuza, a professor of Economics in the University of Jasi, is the presiding genius of the movement.

The programs of these organizations indicate their aims. "The League for National-Christian Defense" advocates that political rights be taken from Jews and that they be prevented from becoming citizens, that they be expelled from rural communes and their property expropriated, that their forest contracts be cancelled and their oil concessions expropriated, that city property they own be taken, that they be forbidden public office, that a "numerus clausus" ("closed number," that is, proportional admission only) be established for all cultural and

economic activities, and that punishment for certain business, political and social crimes, alleged to be frequently committed by Jews, be made very rigorous.

The students' organization, in its program, asks, too, for the "numerus clausus" in all social activities as well as in colleges and the "numerus nullus" (i.e. no Jewish students at all) in the Agricultural Colleges. Many of its demands refer to special measures in behalf of students, such as half fare on the railroads, scholarships, student loans, etc. Student government of an extensive form so as to permit nationalist activities, is demanded with the addendum that the university is to recognize all student organizations provided only that the National Roumanian Christian Students Union endorses them. Certain general economic proposals are included in the program. Two odd planks are inserted. One condemns the Y. M. C. A. as a Jewish organization and the other calls for a "cadaver law" to have Jewish medical students dissect only Jewish cadavers as a condition of their taking examinations. The platform declares that the organization is strongly Orthodox and against other religious bodies.

Propaganda is carried on through newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, calendars, congresses, political activity, and the use of the swastika. As explained by Professor Cuza, the swastika is an Arian emblem especially dear to the Thracians and Dacians, whom, along with Trajan and the Romans, the Roumania nationalists glorify as their ancestors. Professor Cuza states also that it is the primitive form of the Cross. To the anti-Semites it becomes the emblem of "Purity of Race, Undiminished Faith, and Integrity of the National Soil."

At the height of their agitation, the organizations published several newspapers and magazines, and sold them by subscription and on newstands. It is not unusual to see in the great outdoor restaurants, which abound in Roumania in the summer, a young university student moving about from table to table selling anti-Semitic newspapers to the guests.

The character of the propaganda may best be shown by a glance at the printed material. One issue of Apararea Nationala (National Defense), organ of the League for National Christian Defense, leads off with an article entitled "The Y. M. C. A. is the Creation of Yiddish Free Masonry." The second article is "Jewish Ability," the first page of which deals with the subject and the other three with the Marmorosch-Blank Bank of Bucharest, a bank predominantly Jewish and a competitor of the National Bank, though containing in its direction representatives from the Bratianu group and the opposition party. The third article is an attack on Spinoza, as an exponent of Judaism. The fourth is given over to an account of a certain Jewess in the English Secret Service. Then comes a page on the swastika, a page of quotations from Voltaire on the Jews, and three pages of news and book notes. The covers advertize anti-Semite literature. The tone is bitter throughout but not violent.

It is in the newspapers that the tone becomes shrill and feverish. The name of one paper is in letters two inches high. A row of swastikas run across the page. Immediately following, the Jews or "Sheenies" are accused of using corruption and violence to stop the publication of the paper. The remaining pages are in keeping.

There are appeals to farmers, students, and the consumers, accusing Jews of crimes.

Many pamphlets are printed. One by Cuza on the Numerus Clausus is an answer to Jorga, the Roumanian historian who had termed the Numerus Clausus an absurdity. It pictures the Marmorosch-Blank Bank acting the Greek Chorus to Jorga, solemnly singing "Ab-surd-i-ty." The Numerus Clausus, Cuza says, is one phase of a long battle to preserve the Roumanian nation from defeat by the Jews. Another pamphlet gives a strained and strange interpretation of the mission of Christ as a leader of anti-Semitism. To justify the new interpretation of Christ, Cuza presents a preface in which, among other things, he accuses Christian theology of suppressing the true mission of Christ.

The articles of incorporation of the National-Christian Defense League are revealing. Various reasons are given for forming the league—serious competition of foreigners with Roumanians in industry and commerce, the particular seriousness of the competition of Jews, "progressive denationalization" of the country, its transformation into a Jewish economic colony, corruption of Roumanian culture, and threats against the very existence of the Roumanian nation. Its aim is to support through all legal means, the economic, political, and cultural interest of Roumanians against the Jews.

CUZA PROGRAM

I Drive every Jew out of Greater Roumania.

II Refuse to employ any Jew for any kind of work.

III Do not permit any Jew to attend any class in any school within Roumania.

IV Do not buy from any Jew.

V Do not sell to any Jew.

VI Do not allow any Jew to vote or take part in any election.

VII Keep the Jews out of all positions of honor, emolument, or service to the State.

Chapter V

THE GOVERNMENTAL ATTITUDE AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW

THE greatest revolution in Roumania would be to have the officials observe the law. This comment was made to us, and our experience led us to feel that there was much justification for it. Many factors contribute to the perversion of the law in its administration.

First, the character and intelligence of the local official has much to do with it. For example, there are about 20,000 heads of Jewish families in Roumania who have found it so far impossible to prove their citizenship according to the law of February 24, 1923, which stipulates that only those can be citizens who were citizens on December 20, 1918, and can prove this citizenship by documents. Where records were accurately kept under governments to which the territory was formerly allied, as in Bessarabia, Russian troops burned these records on their retreat, and it is comparatively easy for unsympathetic officials to make it impossible for such persons to establish their citizenship. Corrupt officials, on the other hand, will for baksheesh supply the necessary proofs. In Cernauti, the case of an Ukrainian is an illustration in point. His grandfather was born in Cernauti, the family has lived there for 150 years, but it has been impossible for him, as yet, to secure his citizenship from the courts, due to the attitude of the courts, while all the time tomb-

stones in the cemetery substantiate his claim. Again, the registration in the census seems to depend a great deal upon the attitude of the particular official. Through the country districts the officials themselves make the registrations. Ukrainians have been known to have been put down as Roumanians because they belonged to the Orthodox Church. Many instances came to our attention of persons who have spoken German or Hungarian for generations and do not know a word of Roumanian, but because their names suggested or could be made to suggest a Roumanian origin, they were registered as Roumanians. The importance of this for political reasons is evident. Jews who have identified themselves for generations with the Magyar culture of the country in which they live and who, according to their rights, had the privilege of declaring themselves Hungarian, were accused of false registration, fined, and compelled to regard either Hebrew or Roumanian their native tongue. While seventy-five per cent of the district of Cernauti is Ukrainian, the population was divided up into five different nationalities in order to make the Ukrainian minority less important, and we were informed that the prefects were instructed to register these people as they saw fit. An outstanding illustration of the way in which the administration of law depends upon the character of the local officials is, of course, the persecutions of the Baptists which are cited elsewhere.

Second, the commission so frequently heard the statement that secret orders come out from Bucharest modifying and sometimes completely reversing a law or regulation that we are persuaded that something of this sort

does occur. In addition, there are apparently verbal orders given out with the same intent.

Third, the frequent changes of the government in Roumania bring it about that modifications of agrarian expropriation, promises of subvention, etc., are never fulfilled. Many such adjustments, which were promised by the Averescu government before its fall but never completed, came to our attention.

Fourth, there seems to be much willful perversion for some sinister end. For instance, in one town a Roman Catholic church established by Maria Theresa was without any warning taken over and given to the Roumanian state church on the pretext that since it was established by the then queen of the country for the then state religion, it properly belongs to the present state religion. An illustration of an entirely different sort concerns the right to vote. Citizens must register and are then informed that their certificate for voting will be sent to them through the mails. During the last election, while travelling 150 miles, we saw crowds of persons on the steps of the town halls in the cities and villages through which we passed whose certificates for voting had never arrived through the mail. This was a predominantly Hungarian district, hence a good many votes that in all likelihood would have been cast either for the National Peasants' Party or the Hungarian Party were not cast. The tricks resorted to in order to make an over-whelming Liberal Party victory and witnessed by us were, however, too many to cite here, and are somewhat aside from the purpose of this report.

The administration of the Agrarian Reform Law afforded opportunity for a vast amount of whimsical discrimination which many citations in the report illustrate. Churches and schools that owned an amount of land within the allotment allowed by the Agrarian Law were forced to surrender a part or the whole of such land, in many instances, in order that the Eastern Orthodox Church might have its full allotment. In some cases the officials and officers of the government who had been brought into the annexed territory when Roumania took charge, divided the expropriated land among themselves, and your committee was informed of instances where these new owners then rented out their land to its former owners or even sold the land, in spite of the regulation that no one to whom land is given shall sell it within fifteen years. We were informed that in the whole county of Csik, not one Roman Catholic priest received land in the redistribution. A typical illustration of the unfair administration of the law is that of the Roman Catholic parish in Szentpeter which had 1,500 acres of forest worth 150 millions, which was all taken away and in return for which state bonds were voted at the value of eighteen millions. The real value of the bonds was only forty per cent of this, and in spite of the vote, up to the time of the commission's visit none of these bonds had been received. The irregularities of administration in connection with the schools is amply dealt with elsewhere in this report.

The sum and substance of the matter is that Roumania is an extreme example of government by persons rather than laws, and that wherever it is to the advantage of the Roumanian stock and the Roumanian institutions

and the general policy of Roumanization, ways will always be found to circumvent or interpret the law in such a way that what is desired may be done. The result is that peoples annexed to the old kingdom and used to the idea that a law means and will enforce what it says, have little confidence in their present government. The tragedy of the situation is that the real opportunity of Roumanization which could have been carried on by generous dealing with those who were to be won to sympathy for and interest in their new country has thus been lost.

Chapter VI

CITIZENSHIP

THE questions involved in the granting of citizenship in Roumania are varied, numerous, and complicated. A large increase in the population, with demands thrust upon a State in which there has been little or no previous practical experience with so difficult a problem, made it almost impossible to deal with the situation in a broad way, and made difficult the settlement that is absolutely just to the individual, and fair to the State as a whole.

Viewed from the standpoint of practical politics, the facts are these: Roumania found herself with the responsibility of providing the status of citizenship for 5,500,000 people, with a place in the State that would satisfy not only the rights involved, but which would square also with the ideas of justice and fair-dealing embodied in the requirements of the Nations who had permitted Roumania's expansion. These requirements were written into a Minorities Treaty, which was signed and agreed to by the Roumanian Government.

Under the provisions of this Treaty, Roumania pledged "full guarantees of liberty and justice to all inhabitants, both of the old Kingdom of Roumania and of the territory added thereto, to whatever race, language, or origin they may belong."

In Article 2, Chapter 1, of this Treaty, Roumania undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all of the inhabitants of Roumania.

Article 3 stipulates that "Roumania admits and declares Roumanian nationals ipso facto and without requirements of any formality, all persons habitually resident at the date of the going into force of the present Treaty, within the whole territory of Roumania, including the extensions made by the Treaties of Peace with Austria and Hungary, or any other extensions which may hereafter be made."

Then provision was made whereby Austrian and Hungarian nationals were given the privilege of expressing their choice of nationality and of moving out of Roumania within twelve months after having exercised their option. They were to be permitted to take with them all of their movable property, at the same time holding their real estate intact, subject to the laws governing all properties in Roumania, while living in the country of which they have chosen to become nationals. By Article 7, this same agreement applies also to the Jews.

Article 9, which is as follows, further guarantees the rights of citizenship for all the people living within the country who have desired to be recognized as Roumanian citizens—"Roumanian nationals who belong to racial, religious, or linguistic minorities, shall enjoy the same liberties in law and in fact, as do the other Roumanian nationals."

In spite of the fact that Article 1 of the Peace Treaty provides that only stipulations in the Minority Treaty relating to the rights of citizenship shall be considered as the fundamental law of the land, and cannot be changed by any constitutional or legal enactment, the new constitution of Roumania adopted in 1923 provides several in-

stances of what appear to be contradictions of this agreement as set forth in the Treaty. However, the plans in regard to the Constitution and the larger questions involved in the interpretation of this Constitution are matters with which this Committee does not feel competent to deal. These are questions that can only be settled by a court of law, and their discussion pre-supposes a legal training that is possessed by no member of the commission, and is clearly not in the field of the Rights of Religious Minorities.

There are certain fundamental principles involved, however, which made it necessary for the commission to enquire into this situation, and from the evidence secured, the commission is agreed that in the administration of the law there are grave injustices practiced upon certain of the minority groups. The new constitution of Roumania, however valid and admirable it may be in most respects, is so used that in many respects its provisions fall short in their application. This is due perhaps to the inability of the State to secure a large enough corps of competent administrators to make effective its own laws. Nevertheless, the commission is agreed that it found ample evidence that in questions involving citizenship and the administration of laws relating thereto, under-officials throughout the new territory added to the Roumanian State are using their position and their influence as a means for corruption and bribery. Baksheesh is common everywhere. For instance, an intelligent Roumanian citizen in Chishinau, whose standing in the community is beyond criticism and whose loyalty to the state is unquestionable, when asked how officials dare to administer

the laws relating to citizenship as reported, replied: "It is all a question of baksheesh. The official in question needs the money; the people who apply for citizenship need the protection of the state. It is therefore simply a question of supply and demand."

In Transylvania the commission found from various sources that the Treaty which pledges citizenship to Jews on the same terms as to other inhabitants of the country is not carried out. Thousands of Jews in Transylvania have no citizenship. In Cluj, the situation is not quite so bad as in Maramaros Sziget and Bistritza, where the authorities have been and are playing fast and loose with the law of the land. There is a society in Cluj called "Actinena Romana" which was organized in 1922. It is made up principally of university professors, students, and army officers. It was frankly organized by anti-Semites to be used as a club over the heads of the Jews. For nearly five years this Society has had access to the lists of applicants for citizenship. Every individual who "opted" for Roumania had to go through certain formalities, and the dosier of these individuals was handed over to this committee. Whenever a Jewish name was found, a protest was registered against it on some ground and in consequence very few Jews received the right of citizenship which the constitution guaranteed them.

There are Jewish organizations in Cluj which try to help in this situation by furnishing legal advice and fighting the Courts for the rights of the individual. The Transylvanian Jewish National Council has headquarters at Cluj. The Union of Roumanian Jews is an effective organization which also has a branch in Bessarabia. In

this latter province, the question is not one of free choice of citizenship as in Transylvania. In many cases, because of the claim of the Government that there has been a very great immigration of Jews into Bessarabia since it became a part of Roumania, the Jew who claims to have been born within the province is disputed by the Government which says that he has come over the line from Russia. It is very difficult to prove either contention and thus the way is opened for graft and abuse on the part of the officials.

There are also conflicting ideas among the Jewish organizations which further complicate the situation. One group desires complete assimilation of the Jew with Roumania, while the National Jewish Council is trying to organize the Jews of the entire country as a minority to keep them under the protection of the Minority Treaty.

In the meantime, the individual seeking citizenship suffers both from the fact that he is not permitted the full rights of citizenship, and is prevented from seeking these rights in any other land.

The importance of this question is evident from the fact that in all Roumania it is estimated that there are 20,000 heads of Jewish families who are citizens of no country. This means that there is approximately a mass of 100,000 people who, because they are unable to obtain the necessary papers, cannot claim protection from Roumania although they must remain in the land—truly people without a country. Perhaps not more than five per cent of these have come into the country since the Treaty was signed. Those who have come since present, of course, a different problem. They have no claim to citizenship other than

that granted to any foreigner who enters the country and wishes to be a Roumanian citizen.

For some reason General Averscu, when he was Premier, let down the barriers for a short period, and permitted a number of these Jews to become citizens. The only reason given the commission for this was the suspicion that graft was connected with it—again the matter of "supply and demand."

There are men born in Roumania whose fathers and grandfathers lived in Roumania who yet cannot obtain citizenship. They live in constant fear lest an anti-Semitic movement develop and they be expelled from the country —the only country that they have ever known.

An interesting illustration of the application of a law aimed at the Jews so that they who are not actually citizens are recognized as foreigners was discovered in Bucharest. No foreigner can be admitted to the state schools except in the proportion of one to four and no foreigner can form any society for holding property. Consequently, these Jews who are not citizens sent their children to private schools, to mission schools, or schools established by the synagogues. One man told the commission that he was ordered out of the country, with 24 hours in which to leave and take his wife and four children with him. The commission, of course, has no evidence to support the statement that this is a common occurrence. In fact, it is an extreme case and yet the same thing might happen to any one of these thousands of heads of families who are without protection either from the State or from outside.

The non-citizen living in Roumania has the following disabilities:

1. He cannot live in the country for more than one year, except by special permission.
2. He is not granted permission to work at a trade, except under special and most irksome restrictions.
3. He cannot settle down in one place permanently.
4. He cannot enter his children in the public schools, except in a ratio of one to four, counting the children of citizens.
5. He cannot be employed by the State.
6. He cannot make business contracts with the State.
7. He cannot hold land in his own name.
8. He cannot enter the professions.
9. He cannot get a passport to travel.

In all, therefore, he is in the peculiar position of being in a country without any rights, with few privileges, without any legal status so that he can remain, and with no means of getting out. Such things make it possible for the law to be administered in such a way as to further the evil purposes of the most venal agent of the government. The commission heard more complaints and more reports of extortion when it discussed the question of citizenship than in the discussion of any other matter.

In Transylvania, the Roumanians have resurrected an old Hungarian law which was in force years ago which requires a residence of six years to qualify for poor relief. This law did not deal with citizenship as Hungarians

had a more direct method of dealing with that question; namely, by limiting citizenship to a very small group. The Roumanians however have applied this regulation to citizenship.

The Commission found in the Banat a new regulation which is applied optionally, by which a man may be deprived of his citizenship for very slight reasons. One of the Jewish merchants said, "Today I am a citizen; tomorrow I may find that I am not a citizen."

One of the officials told the commission of a law which requires that a man live in one place uninterruptedly for ten years before he can apply for citizenship. On application he must renounce his old nationality. When this has been done the application is often held up, and the result is that he is neither a Roumanian nor a citizen of his old country. He may at any time be put over the frontier as an alien. This actually happened in one instance at Kurtics in 1919.

The best people of Roumania with whom the commission discussed this question feel that this, like many other of the problems with which the country is faced, is complicated by the bad political situation.

The rights and privileges of citizenship are the greatest boon a country can confer upon individuals living within its borders, but the use of this powerful instrument as a weapon in the hands of political leaders is a dangerous practice.

From unquestionably good sources, and from dozens of men who have the best interests of Roumania at heart, the commission was given evidence of a strong desire on the part of the country that this whole matter should be

given careful consideration and adjustments made. Also it was suggested that the matter should not be left to a Council of Ministers at Bucharest, but should be determined upon a broader basis which will make for stability, peace, and quiet throughout the whole realm.

Chapter VII

THE SCHOOLS

Education in Roumania

The Situation in Brief

EDUCATIONAL leaders of Roumania are meeting zealously a tremendous problem of widespread illiteracy. The least advanced part of the country is the section which used to be Russian; the Regat itself is slightly more advanced; while the most advanced region is that which was formerly Hungarian. The school laws and policy, however, give the advanced section no autonomy and dominate both the administration and the teaching force from the Regat. School laws have been conceived with the conditions of the Regat primarily in mind and only secondarily for the Roumanian-speaking people. Apart from the political dominance of both administration and teaching force, the law meets the needs of the Roumanian-speaking people fairly well, particularly those of Roumanian race. Towards the minorities, however, both the law and the administrative practice, dominated by foreign political fears, have been harsh and short-sighted. Only very inadequate provision has been made in the state schools for teaching in the minority language, partly because of the dependence of the minorities on confessional schools in the past, and partly because of the governmental policy of Roumanization. The law and administrative practice are throttling and ruining the confessional schools, which hitherto have been the heart of the minority educational

system, by such processes as the confiscation of endowments and buildings, the witholding of promised subsidies, and harsh regulations. Administrative pressure tends to crush the schools by withholding or threatening to withhold the right of "publicity;" by forcing the teaching of Roumanian; by removing autonomy in direction, curriculum, methods of teaching, teaching force, enrollment of pupils, equipment, and finances; by supervising the schools minutely and in a spirit often unfriendly; and by discriminating unfairly in giving examinations. The laws of 1925 and the regulations supplementing them are political measures, narrowly nationalistic, repressive towards the minorities, and worse than the Apponyi laws of Hungary.

I

Roumania's Educational Problem

The present Roumanian school system shows some of the best and some of the worst elements of the newly aroused nationalism. The country in 1919 and 1920 was faced with the pressing need of providing schools for a great Roumanian-speaking population relieved from conditions which every Roumanian regarded as those of bondage. Thirty per cent of the Roumanians of Transylvania and the Banat, sixty per cent of the Roumanians of Bukovina, and more than ninety per cent of the Roumanians of Bessarabia could neither read nor write. In the territory annexed from Russia there is said to have been not a single school in the Roumanian language in 1914. In Chishinau, we observed that the cab-drivers invariably ran into some store to get a written address

read, not because of stupidity but because under Russian rule only six out of a hundred of them had learned to read and write. In this region less than two per cent of the women were literate. Even in old Roumania, or the Regat, as it is called, at least half the people living in backward villages were quite illiterate. Some observers estimated that three-fourths of old Roumania could neither read nor write. A desire for education had to be created in the villages, school buildings provided, and new teachers trained. It was a herculean task.

There is much that is discreditable to Russia, Austria, and Hungary in the neglect of the Roumanian peasants in the territory formerly belonging to them. Russia neglected all its people. Hungary provided for about two-thirds of the despised Roumanians a rudimentary education only, making almost no arrangements for middle or higher education for them. In Transylvania there were 1,536 Orthodox schools and 1,119 Uniat schools in the Roumanian language out of a total of 5,651 schools, while each church educated its own children under strict Magyarizing provisions. Such a situation did not predispose the Roumanian educational leaders or people to deal gently with the Hungarians or Russians who, by the treaties of peace, were incorporated in Greater Roumania.

The population of Roumania was formerly homogeneous, except for the five per cent of Jews. Today Roumania is a polyglot kingdom without experience in dealing with linguistic, racial, or even religious minorities. Some of her mistakes have come from the attempt to imitate or outdo the policies of her neighbors. There

seems to us to be no doubt that the extraordinary quickening in some phases of Roumanian life has resulted from the varied additions which have been made to her population. The new elements are an asset, not a liability and ought to have been treated as such. No better instance could be cited than the fact that the incorporation into the Roumanian nation of many Magyar-speaking Jews has helped the nation greatly to adopt a more progressive educational policy towards the Roumanian-speaking Jews of the Regat.

The Jewish minority, which comprises five-eighths of the Jewish population in Roumania, had well developed school systems in the annexed territory. The schools in districts formerly belonging to Hungary used the Magyar language, although Hebrew was beginning to replace it. The schools in districts formerly belonging to Russia used Yiddish or Hebrew under the new regime. Some provision would naturally be expected by which these schools would also teach Roumanian, but actually, as will be seen, much harsher measures were imposed. Under the atrocious pre-war conditions all but 1,200 of the Jewish group who lived in the Regat were "supusi-Ruman," sub-Roumanian, without rights as citizens, and practically excluded from the public schools. Only in the last few years have they been able to get their synagogues recognized and have schools of their own by adding classrooms to them. Today their schools are given some recognition, and Jewish children are given places in the public schools in increasing numbers. This past year the Instructionea, one of their private schools, gained the right to give examinations and diplomas—the first to get

that privilege. Jewish children of Bucharest who attended school at all used to go to private schools or schools of the churches or missions.

The Roumanian educational authorities had also the task of planning for the Magyar-speaking, German-speaking, and Ukrainian-speaking peoples whose children formerly attended confessional schools or the state schools of Russia, Austria, or Hungary. These groups had long established and highly efficient systems of confessional schools, most of which possessed endowments of land. With the disappearance of many forms of bond investment in the war, endowments other than land disappeared. In the former Hungarian territory there were several hundred schools which belonged to the churches but the use of which had been given to the Hungarian Government under six or seven conditions, such as, that they were to be turned back on demand, and that the pupils of that particular denomination were to be educated in the religion of that denomination. The German-speaking people include a remarkable group of Saxons who had splendid, ancient, Lutheran schools, and the Swabians in the Banat who had highly efficient schools under Roman Catholic direction. The Ukrainians or Ruthenians, as they are called in Austria, had private and confessional schools. It was to be expected that Roumania would take steps to see that the children of these minorities should learn the Roumanian language as well as their own. In view of the tremendous difficulty of educating her own illiterates, it was to be expected also that the state would continue to encourage the confessional schools. It was unquestionably to her interest to use all

the educated leaders she could find, for she needed them and still needs them sorely. From the standpoint of Roumania's own welfare, quite apart from justice or the stipulation of the treaties, she might well have given some of those connected with these institutions, teachers, scientists, agriculturists, engineers, administrators, opportunity to lead and to serve her. Unfortunately her educational policy has been affected by blindly suspicious, bitter, chauvinistic politicians. That policy has never been worse than in the last two years.

II

Constructive Roumanian Movements

Roumania deserves credit for the many good things which she has done for her own populace in an educational way. The steady development of Roumania in education since 1893 has been an admirable story. The new movement began in that year under Theodor Costescu of Turn-Severin and Take Jonescu who established schools in the villages. Costescu erected in the villages no less than seventy school buildings from volunteer labor and volunteer gifts. He held the people of the village to their labor contracts and when they complained to Jonescu, who was Minister of Education, the latter stood by him. Prefects in various counties of the Regat imitated his methods. Professor Mehedintzi as Minister of Education began a system of two-day schools in the villages, but unfortunately with the fall of the government to which he belonged, his system was not continued. By 1896 the Regat had undertaken to build up a system of free and compulsory education. By the school

year 1914-15 there were 5,344 schools which graduated 56,485 pupils and enrolled 620,565 pupils, 8.3 per cent of the population of the country. By 1923 there were 7,415 primary schools in the same districts. Since the annexation of new territory many new schools have been added, both in the Regat and for Roumanians in the annexed territories. In 1920 there were 19,379 schools, including those of the new districts and the schools of the minorities. By 1926 there were 35,000 primary schools. In seven years nearly 15,000 new schools have been established and almost 10,000 new buildings have been erected, nearly all state school buildings for Roumanian pupils. In Transylvania and the Banat, the number of Roumanian lycée pupils has increased in five years from 4,700 to 22,000.

In order to supply the new schools with a teaching staff, the Roumanian leaders had to rush young people through the normal schools in great numbers. We visited normal schools in several cities. In Chishinau, Jasi, Cernauti (Czernowitz), Cluj (Kolozsvár), and other cities, we found that the new normal schools were full to overflowing. The system includes boarding homes or internats for practically every school. We saw dormitory rooms with beds for the pupils, eighteen inches apart, and dormitories crowded full of pupils, practically all Roumanian and Orthodox, who had been brought from the villages to the cities for normal training. The number of teachers has increased from 7,506 in 1914 to 18,362 in 1924 in the Regat and 34,200 in Greater Roumania. The standard is low, necessarily. Pupils are received into normal schools at the end of the fourth grade. The

normal school course is nominally seven years, but actually that time is often shortened because of the pressing need. Roumania deserves great credit for the vision with which she has mustered thousands of young people to train them as future teachers. That she has not yet been able to set her standard of scholarship as high as her vision, can be readily understood.

This great work is absorbing the energy of the Roumanian reformers. We met some splendid Roumanian professors who have undertaken this educational development as their life work. Men like Tzitzeica in Bucharest and Barbat in Cluj are giving themselves freely for the neglected people of the villages. Unfortunately the absorbing demand on such public-spirited men has left no reserve of time or energy for interest in juster treatment of the minorities and the modification of the state's harsh treatment of them.

Other excellent cultural movements have been paralleling the development of the schools. Haret, Minister of Education in the 1880's, began the organization of a system of village banks with the economic welfare of the neglected peasants in mind. The Astra movement began at Alba Julia fifty years ago. Its purpose was to organize clubs, lectures, meetings in the villages. It spread all over Transylvania. It is now reported to be active in partisan politics with a view to obtaining governmental favors. University extension work in the villages is taking the time and energy of some of the best Roumanians. There are centers in sixty villages near Cluj. Last winter 300 students went out from the University every week-end for this work. A leader in this movement said: "When

I think of the low level of my people, I want to weep. Our Roumanian young people are not stupid, but quick to learn. In ten years we will have an educated Roumania."

Under the Red Cross and other organizations, health work in the villages has been greatly stimulated. The Vatra Noastra movement under Professor Tzitzeica is doing excellent work in the Regat to raise the standard of life in villages around Bucharest. There are several movements also for physical training in the villages. General I. Manolescu working with the National League for Physical Education is attempting also to put social centers in the villages. Volunteer dentists take part in this work. These movements are part of the nationalist renaissance which is one of the most striking tendencies in Roumania today. It is only fifty years since the Battle of Plevna ended the old Turkish misrule which was a blight that ruined nearly every place it touched. A country which, within fifty years after its liberation from the Turk, can go so far, deserves much credit. Roumania is the battle-ground where the culture of the west is fighting against the ideas of the east.

On the other hand, Roumania's treatment of the great minority groups is a different story.

III

The State Organizes Foreign-language Sections in the State Schools

The 700,000 German-speaking people, the 800,000 Ukrainian-speaking people, the 2,250,000 Magyar-speak-

ing people, the 350,000 Bulgars, and the other minorities* should not be thought of as immigrants into Roumania. They did not come as individuals seeking admission into Roumania but were received as residents of annexed territories. In some instances groups of them have kept alive their languages and culture for generations in the midst of peoples who spoke other tongues, as for example the Saxons who have lived among Magyars for 700 years. Their expectation was that they would be allowed to maintain their customs and speech as have the French-speaking Canadians in the midst of an English-speaking race.

Article 10 of the Treaty of Paris stated: "Roumania will provide in the public educational system in towns and districts, in which a considerable proportion of Roumanian nationals of other than Roumanian speech are resident, adequate facilities for ensuring that in the primary schools the instruction shall be given to the children of such Roumanian nationals through the medium of their own language. This provision shall not prevent the Roumanian Government from making the teaching of the Roumanian language obligatory in the said schools.

"In towns and districts where there is a considerable proportion of Roumanian nationals belonging to racial, religious, or linguistic minorities, these minorities shall be assured an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of the sums which may be provided out of public

---

*

	Roumanian	*Magyar*
Banat including Yugoblat Banat	592,049	242,152
Transylvania	1,472,021	918,217
Plain of Hungary	874,457	1,093,873

Figures from Hungarian census of 1910, in Cabot. The Roumanian figures are much less.

funds under the State, municipal, or other budget, for educational, religious, or charitable purposes." The treaty was signed by the Government and ratified by the Parliament of Roumania.

The Government therefore took over some of the existing schools of the annexed regions and transformed them into foreign-language "sections" in her national school system. The official book, "Loi de l'enseignement primaire de l'état, avec un exposé par Dr. C. Anghelescu," of 1925, states that in 1920 there were 500 foreign-language schools in Bessarabia and 256 in 1922 in Bukovina. In Transylvania in 1922, the government supported 562 Magyar, 51 German, and 58 other schools. Some of the former church schools, whose management had been turned over to the Hungarian government, were made minority "sections." The Roumanian state took possession of the property although the churches had never relinquished title to it. Hungarian state schools became Roumanian state schools in many of which Magyar-language sections were opened. In time the school law, embodying existing practice, authorized these "minority sections." Article 7 states: "Primary education in state schools is given in Roumanian. In regions where another language than Roumanian is spoken, the Minister of Public Instruction shall be able to create primary schools having the language of education of the respective population, in the same proportion as in the Roumanian communes. In these schools the study of the Roumanian language will be obligatory for the number of hours set by the Regulations."

Other paragraphs in the law, however, and the method in which the minority sections have been administered, lead to the conclusion that the state had no intention of allowing them to be permanent. Eight facts about the minority sections came under our observation.

1. *In some cities with large foreign-language population, foreign-language schools were never opened, and in others they were made merely nominal.* In Chishinau we were informed that no Yiddish-language sections in either lycées or primary schools exist. In Magyar counties where the Magyar schools were made "sections" of the Roumanian-language schools, these sections were soon closed.

For example: In Tarnava Mare county the Magyar section was closed on the ground that it had few pupils. (The Magyars claim, however, that it had as many pupils as the Roumanian school which was continued.) In a town in Salagiu county, a school promised was never opened. In a city in Satmar county, more than half Magyar-speaking, we found no Magyar section.

In a Cic county town, entirely Szekely in population and Magyar-speaking, there is no Magyar-language section at all, though the county has fifty Roumanian-language teachers.

In a city in Timis county there is no Magyar section for a large Magyar population. In another town in the county of Arad the Magyar section is only for the first two grades.

In other towns the Magyar section is confined to the first four grades with the expectation that then the pupils will have learned Roumanian. One prominent minori-

ty official in Bihar said: "Children from the Magyar sections of the state primary schools cannot read or write Magyar, though some of the state schools still pretend nominally at least to have Magyar sections." Another said: "They try to have all the teaching in Roumanian, but the children don't understand."

So far as we could learn there are in existence no effective Ukrainian-language sections. In Bukovina we were told of one lycée where Ukrainian is supposed to be taught, "but," said our informant, "it is not taught there. The use of Ukrainian is purely nominal." Dr. Anghelescu in his Exposé of the Law of Primary Instruction says that in 1920 there were in Bessarabia 200 Ukranian schools. We were informed that these 200 schools were closed in 1923.

Roumania's fear of Russia has led her to repress the Ukrainians harshly. The best information we could obtain was that the minority sections were simply a temporary expedient, until the children could be free to go to Roumanian-language schools.

2. *The state seeks to place teachers from the Regat in the foreign-language sections.* The law encourages the migration of teachers into the twenty minority-language counties by offering them salaries fifty per cent higher than normal, the use of twenty acres of land, and other privileges. The teachers of the Hungarian regime, reengaged at first by Roumania as they took the oath of allegiance, were gradually replaced and at higher salaries by teachers from the old kingdom. "They drop the Hungarian teachers as soon as they can and replace them with

Roumanians" was a widespread complaint which shows how the law works in practice.

3. *No adequate provision is made for training future teachers of the minority sections.* Article 201 of the Normal School Law provides that where twenty per cent of the pupils of a normal school are of a single minority they are to be taught in their maternal language, but invariably when we inquired we were informed that there was no minority-language normal section. The normal schools of the state are very ingenious in their attempts to justify their exclusion of Jewish pupils. We found that none of the Jews and very few of the other minorities are admitted to normal schools.

4. *In the minority sections the Roumanian language not only is compulsory but crowds out the minority language.* Article 7 of the law says "Roumanian shall be obligatory during the number of hours set by the Regulations." Actually the teaching is largely in that language. In a Salagiu town we were informed that a Magyar section gave only two hours a week to teaching in Magyar. In one city a minority church official said: "In the minority sections ninety per cent of the teaching is in Roumanian." In a Banat town we were informed: "Magyar is taught only three hours a week in the primary school." In another city one hour and a half a week is allotted to it. Such schools have evidently been Roumanized. One teacher, coming from the Regat to a school in the purely Szekely region and knowing only Roumanian, burst into tears at her inability to make the pupils understand. In another city a woman church worker of wide experience

said: "Tell the Roumanian authorities that you have seen great sorrow. It is not we grown people who suffer but the poor little children. They can't understand. The teacher says in a foreign tongue, 'Do this' or 'Do that' and they can't understand what she means. Tell them that you have seen us under heavy burdens."

5. *No provision whatever is made for minority "sections" for Roumanians of Jewish faith.* The weird theory holds that if one's religion is Jewish, his language must automatically be the language of the state. Thousands of Jewish children in Bessarabia, Bukovina, and Transylvania knew no Roumanian whatever but were forced into Roumanian-language schools.

6. *Little or no provision is made for minority "sections" in the state lycées, commercial schools, and technical schools.* The foreign-language sections in the lycées in several cities have already been closed. The Hungarian state gymnasia, taken over by the Roumanian state and conducted for a time as Magyar "sections," have mostly been closed. The Roumanians claim that eight Magyar lycées are still open but it is to be remembered that there are a million and a half people whose needs must be met by these lycées. Magyar-speaking boys and girls are almost entirely excluded, we were informed, from the commercial and technical lycées, which are purely Roumanian.

7. *The minorities have no voice in the local administration of the schools.* Article 5 of the law says "Primary teaching is unified in the whole extent of the country." The school system is a single national system based on the idea of a homogeneous population. Sharp local

criticisms of unfortunate conditions too often fail to reach the ears of the authorities in Bucharest.

8. *The quality of the foreign-language sections is at least questionable.* Criticisms made by the minorities about order, methods, and preparation of teachers seemed deserving of attention. In a large proportion of the cases it was claimed that the teachers were ill-prepared and that the quality of the teaching was below par. An observer said: "The spirit of the school here is unprogressive." A German-speaking Roumanian pastor criticized the schools as lacking the spirit which he desired to see in the children of his church. Still another criticism was that the minority sections were chauvinistic.

The policy of the state under the present law and administration is frankly and unmistakably to force the Roumanian language on the minorities through the schools. Dr. Anghelescu is clear about it, saying in his Exposé, page 59: "Primary education in the schools of the state is given in Roumanian. In the schools of the state in regions using another tongue, the maternal language of that population is taught, but in the first four grades the teaching of Roumanian will be obligatory in all schools where education is given in another language. The state claims that all citizens shall know the official language. Our fellow-citizens speaking a foreign tongue may not shut themselves off and isolate themselves in a natural egotism which would make them unfit to take part in the public life of the country." There would be no valid objection to this if it meant that the minorities could be educated in their own languages also. But the state looks to the use of a single language, even among the groups

which have known other tongues for centuries. A German-speaking Roumanian citizen of the Saxon group which settled in the seven walled cities of Siebenbürgen or Transylvania 800 years ago, said pathetically: "We must look to see our children grow up without knowledge of the culture of their ancestors." A Magyar-speaking Roumanian rabbi said: "Our children have never spoken Roumanian. For five generations in this city their families have spoken Magyar. Now the state forces Roumanian on us." A Magyar-speaking Presbyterian Roumanian said: "The foreign-language sections are only for show purposes. They are endeavoring to Roumanize our children." To force the majority language on the residents of annexed territories against their will, is a policy whose success can only be judged by the events of the next twenty-five or fifty years. It is a policy which has often been tried in the past, notably against the Roumanians in Hungary, and frequently has been followed by a vigorous reaction.

IV

Roumania restricts the minorities' confessional schools.

Roumania was not content, however, with weakening the public foreign-language schools but also set out to repress the schools of the minority groups. These were protected by the Treaty of Trianon with its references to nationality, but especially by the Treaty of Paris. As part of the consideration under which the new territories were awarded her, Roumania recognized the existence of various minority groups and guaranteed them equal security and equal educational rights with other Roumanian

nationals, whether a minority group was linguistic, racial, or religious: "Roumanian nationals who belong to racial, religious, or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as the other Roumanian nationals. In particular they shall have an equal right to establish, manage, and control at their own expense, charitable, religious and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their religion freely therein." (Art. 9). This obligation, ratified by the Roumanian Parliament, ought to have been taken in good faith. It was to the advantage of Roumania to create an atmosphere of fair dealing and contentment, as well as to utilize an excellent educational system since her own system was not fully developed. She needs all the trained citizenship she can find to help in the development of her agricultural, mineral and commercial resources, and the improvement of her public service.

In spite of this, however, the government of Roumania shows a disposition to throttle the confessional schools. The Roumanians admit that they do not want them. A prominent Roumanian said to us: "I believe the denominational schools will gradually decrease in number." A prominent Roumanian university professor said: "We must crowd the Magyar-language schools out in order to break the pre-war attempt of the Hungarians to spread their language in Transylvania. For perhaps twenty years we must repress them." A Metropolitan Bishop of the Roumanian Orthodox Church said: "Our point of view about the confessional schools is that the government schools can properly teach religion and language for

the minorities. A good government teacher can teach religion as well as a confessional school teacher." A prominent Roumanian is quoted as saying: "The Anghelescu law is a police law against the minority schools." An impartial observer in Bucharest made the statement: "The avowed object of the Liberals (the party which controls the present government and was headed by Jon Bratianu until his death last November) is to get all education into their own hands."

The reasons for the suppression of the minorities through the educational system are the extreme nationalism of certain politicians, fear of foreign aggression, fear of the peasant population, and suspicion of the minorities. A Roumanian state official said: "We fear Russian imperialism." The whole school system has been harmed by panic, and suspicion has led to discrimination against the minorities. To the same causes is due also the excessive centralization of school administration. Local autonomy in school matters would undoubtedly prevent much friction, allay the dissatisfaction of large groups, and mollify people who now feel that they are unfairly treated. The psychology of fear, however, has led to a desire to centralize all educational administration at Bucharest. "Build up Bucharest" is the policy of the present government. Thus the government has not allowed the local authorities to rectify local grievances and answer local complaints.

The effects of Roumanian laws and administration on the confessional schools we found to be as follows:

1. *In the agrarian reform the land endowments of the schools were confiscated by the state, and although tracts*

of land were in many cases returned, these have been small. The German-speaking Lutheran minority had 3,500 acres (jugars) of landed estate. Under the agrarian laws this was confiscated by the Roumanian government. On the other hand we were informed that the government granted the use of 100 acres of agricultural land and 600 acres of woodland for the support of the bishop's office at Sibiu.

The Magyar schools suffered even more severely. The Roman Catholic Status, the holding body for the bishopric of Transylvania, had about 24,000 acres of land, the income of which was used for seven gymnasia or lycées. The state expropriated 19,291 acres and left to the Status 4,647 acres of forest land and 60 of grain land. The Unitarian lycée in Cristurul Sacuese lost all its land. The ancient Presbyterian "Collegium" or lycée at Aiud (Nagy-enyed), a famous preparatory school founded before 1622, had 7,000 acres of woodland and 4,000 acres of grain land as its endowment. All was confiscated, but the government has promised to return to the college 120 acres of grain land and 2,500 acres of woodland. The woodland is important as it supplies the fuel needed in the severe winters of the lower Danube region. This lycée was the only one of the seven Presbyterian lycées to receive any substantial grant of land from the government in the distribution following the agrarian laws. The others have been treated much more severely. In general the good land has been largely confiscated, and what is left is non-income-producing. We discovered no instance of land being granted to Jewish private schools, although we made repeated inquiries.

We found, however, a feeling among the Magyar-speaking minorities that the government had, in the matter of expropriation of lands, shown some willingness to confer with them.

Much of the expropriated land is still held by the state. The government has set an excellent precedent in making grants of this land to the Lutheran Centrum, the Roman Catholic Status, and the Presbyterian Collegium at Aiud, even though these grants be but a small part of the former holdings.

2. *Heavy economic pressure on the minority peoples has prevented them from supporting the confessional schools adequately.* The schools might under ordinary conditions, have relied on contributions from the well-to-do, but economic pressure has been hard on the very minorities who had the most schools. This pressure is both from taxation for state schools and from the strangling of business in minority centers. The well-to-do merchants or landed proprietors, who in the past gave land or money for Jewish, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, and Unitarian schools, have been stripped of their land. Special rules, however, allowed the boyars of the Regat to retain large holdings, Prince Stirbey, brother-in-law of the late Jon Bratianu being reported still to hold 10,000 acres. Pressure on the minority banks, interferences with trade, and other restrictions are said to have caused over eighty business failures in 1926 in the Magyar city of Cluj with almost 100,000 people, a number which will probably be exceeded in 1927. In addition to state taxes for teachers' salaries, parish inhabitants are required by law to provide wood and lighting for the state school,

and lodging for the Roumanian-language teachers even in towns predominantly Magyar-speaking. The prefects of the counties are accustomed to levy "cultural taxes," quite outside the law, from which they may erect school buildings. Funds so raised are spent at the discretion of the prefect, who makes no printed report. At the funeral of a Roumanian prefect in Cluj two years ago it was stated that he had raised funds through private subscriptions for no less than 200 state school buildings.

The obvious policy for the state, in view of the historic custom of the minorities to rely mainly on confessional schools for education, and in view of the desperately heavy economic burdens they carry, would be to relieve them, in case they support their own school, of part of the burden of the state schools.

3. *Confiscation of property.* In the strain of war, Roumania was obliged to occupy minority confessional school buildings, dormitories, and other property. Some of these buildings have been already returned. Certain minority clergymen and church and school officers with whom we talked were hopeful that other pieces of property would in time be returned. There seems to be no question, however, that a great deal of church school property is still unnecessarily in government hands.

4. *The State has paid subventions or subsidies to confessional schools, but on no equal basis.* It has already made a precedent by paying subventions to the German-speaking Lutheran schools to the amount of about 8,000,000 lei ($48,000) a year. It has also paid a slight subvention, 2,000 lei ($12), to the Roman Catholic elementary schools in Timisoara. (The printed Budget of

the Ministry of Instruction for 1927, however, as placed in our hands, contains no figures for subventions to confessional schools.) The present government made election promises of subventions for the Jewish lycées in order to secure the Jewish vote. In 1923 subventions were promised the Jewish lycées of Chishinau, but never given. The Averescu government in its election promises of 1922 and 1926, in return for the Magyar vote, promised subsidies for the Magyar-speaking confessional schools, but the promises were unfulfilled. The minorities claim that Article 10 of the Treaty of Paris, stating that "these minorities shall be assured an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of the sums which may be provided out of the public funds under the State, municipal or other budget, for educational, religious or charitable purposes," guarantees a share in the national budget for their schools. The government has admitted this claim by inserting in the Law for Primary Education, Article 161, which says: "In the centers of populations speaking another language than Roumanian, in which the communes support, conformably to the above sections, primary schools with Roumanian as the language of teaching, the state shall contribute in an equitable measure to the support of the minority private schools which have the right of publicity." In spite of the law and the promises, the burden of support is still on the minority people who are taxed for the Roumanian-speaking teachers and required to maintain Roumanian-speaking schools as well as the schools in their own language and of their own churches.

5. *The financial pressure on the schools is far less,*

however, than the administrative pressure brought by the state under its school law of December, 1925, known as "Lege Pentru Invatamantul Particular," or "Law for Private Instruction." It is supported by a book of regulations issued in 1927 in the name of Minister I. Petrovici. Professing to raise the level of private schools, it actually puts the confessional schools completely in the hands of the administrative authorities, binds them with restrictions of the severest kind, limits the scope of their work, and deprives them of any possible security of tenure. Some of its provisions show a striking resemblance to the harshest clauses of the infamous Apponyi laws of Hungary in 1907 which did much to alienate the sympathy of the English-speaking nations from Hungary, but which were mild by comparison. The law appears to allow the confessional schools to exist and at the same time hampers them incredibly. Their existence is terminable at the whim of the Department acting *in camera.* The law is also full of catches which an unscrupulous official could readily use to embarrass the schools of the churches. It represents the attitude of the chauvinist elements of Roumania toward the minorities. It is a political rather than an educational measure.

(a)—*The right of "publicity."* We found the confessional schools always anxious about their future, which the law makes uncertain. Article 62 says: "The Department may grant to private schools which have the state curriculum and which meet the prescribed conditions of work, a special authorization for publicity." "Publicity" is the right of a school to give its own semi-annual and annual examinations. Without it, lycées must send their pupils

twice a year to public examinations (Art. 60) at prohibitive expense (Art. 59) under severe penalties (Art. 56); a primary school must do the same once a year (Art. 51); and no confessional school teacher is permitted to be an examiner (Art. 55). Without this right no school can hold its pupils. It is, in practice, the right to live. It can be withdrawn inside of six months, after two warnings, by the Department of Instruction, or without notice at all if the Department Council believes the school is against "the higher interests" of the state. In order to secure the right of publicity a school must get an annual permit from the government. The restrictions are so great, however, that practically no schools have yet received an answer to their applications from the government. The schools, which had this right before December 1, 1918, were allowed nominally to hold it. They had, however, to prove that they had possessed it before that date and the Department has made the proof very difficult. A school must send with its application to Bucharest, fifty or more documents relating to internal administrations. It must give intimate details about finances, methods of teaching, arrangements with the teaching staff, and other matters of policy. This not only subjects the school to the loss of autonomy but deprives it of any certainty about its future. In other words, no confessional school has any security of tenure. What donor would endow a school whose right to exist might be arbitrarily terminated at any moment by an administrative department acting at its own discretion in secret session or even by the failure of a negligent official to act? A prominent

official of the minorities said: "Today our Church has under its care 250 schools; we have no idea how many we will have tomorrow."

Instances of the withholding of the right of publicity are the following: The Presbyterian lycée at Satul-mare (Szatmar) was in operation in 1610 A. D. and has been conducted at the same place since that time. Before the war it had about 500 students each year. In 1919, after the Roman Catholic lycée was closed (itself founded in 1810), it had 1,000 students. In 1927, the right of publicity having been refused it, its attendance dropped to 213. The cost of examinations given by government examiners was about 152,000 lei ($870), an average per student of six dollars in a county where teachers' salaries are from fifteen dollars to twenty-five dollars per month. Students could not afford the fees.

At Zalau (Zilah) the Presbyterian church lycée (Wesselenyi College) is 300 years old. After publicity was withdrawn attendance dropped from 350, the pre-war figure, to 170. We found it generally believed that publicity was withdrawn from it because of the visit of the commission of 1924, although other reasons were publicly stated. At Orastie (Szászváros), a region largely Roumanian, the Presbyterian lycée, the well-known Kuun College, had a student body twenty per cent of whom were Roumanian. Both of its buildings were for a time requisitioned by the state. It then lost its right of publicity. Its graduates were flunked steadily in examinations; costs of examinations were high; the student body dropped off, and the building was temporarily closed. The state then claimed the buildings on the ground that

the church had received a subsidy for it from the Hungarian government before the war. The title is still under litigation.

The Roman Catholic normal school at Medias lost its right of publicity and as a result was obliged to give up its work. Another ancient Roman Catholic normal school lost its right in 1926, one charge being that the students greeted visitors with an ancient Magyar greeting "May the Lord Jesus Christ be praised." Unless it regains publicity it is expected to close. The loss of publicity is usually a mortal wound.

(b)—*Autonomy.* The minorities interpreted the treaty as allowing them autonomy in managing their own schools, but the law, the regulations, and the practice of the Department of Instruction have made autonomy an empty dream. The confessional schools have not only been made a part of the state school system with its strong Roumanizing tendency, but are controlled by the state to the very details of teaching. In practice the Department has been using Article 6 of the law concerning permits to require the closest conformity to its demands. Its orders are even more nationalistic than the law, and since February, 1927, have included the requirement that the complete archives of the school be in Roumanian, including correspondence with parents. The politically appointed department refuses to recognize the bi-lingual character of the schools although the law did so.

(c)—*Roumanian language.* The Department of Instruction is striving to force Roumanian on the minorities through the confessional schools. All schools must not only teach Roumanian history, geography and language,

and the constitution, but teach them in Roumanian. In one city a Presbyterian primary school existed with two teachers. None of its pupils used Roumanian at home. It is a strongly Magyar community. Government inspectors came last April and criticized the quality of the work "because the pupils were not perfect in Roumanian." This certainly has the appearance of harshness. Schools run by the teaching orders, Piarist, Franciscan, etc., must use Roumanian throughout (Art. 37). Schools run by congregations must use Roumanian only. Schools run by Jewish communities must do the same, except that these may teach the Hebrew language and religion in Hebrew. A Transylvanian Jewish lycée with 400 students who spoke Magyar at home tried in 1922, before the School law was passed, to introduce the Hebrew language when Magyar was forbidden, and for a time had sixty per cent of its instruction in that language. That is now forbidden. A prominent Transylvanian Jewish lawyer said that the greatest grievance was the Roumanian treatment of Jewish schools, because the government does not respect the right of the Jew to use his mother tongue. He is not allowed to describe himself as a "Magyar-speaking Roumanian of Jewish faith." He must write himself down as of Jewish "nationality," and the law prescribes that the language of the Jew shall be the language of the state. Nor may a child of Jewish religion attend any confessional school in Magyar. Kindergartens must give an hour a day to Roumanian, and if they admit a child of Roumanian descent, or a Jewish or Armenian child, even if the child is of a minority language, must use Roumanian alone. (Art. 37). Teachers must take frequent ex-

aminations in Roumanian, and the officials require it much more frequently than the law makes necessary. For example, the Magyar-speaking teachers of Transylvania have been required to take examinations in Roumanian twice since 1925, although the law allowed them five years in which to take an examination. Under the treaty, apparently, there can be no obligation on church schools to teach Roumanian. The procès-verbal of the League of Nations contains the answer of the council to the complaint of the Magyar minority, stating that the obligation by law on private schools to give instruction in Roumanian is possibly contrary to Article 9.

(d)—*Curriculum.* All primary schools must follow the state curriculum (Art. 9) as must also lycées which expect to give any examinations or certificates to their pupils (Art. 43). Full courses in every subject prescribed in the state schools are required, with the result that, as a Saxon said: "We cannot teach our children the history of their ancestors. We have no autonomy. We are given no alternative in teaching." They cannot import text-books, nor use manuscripts or mimeographed sheets, or unapproved books or maps, under heavy penalties. This requirement followed the practice of some Hungarian teachers immediately after the war of teaching material intended to inflame the minds of students against Roumania, an action quite unpardonable except in the hysteria of such a time. For example, a school was so unwise as to use a set of maps with the words "Occupied Territory" printed over the part of Roumania which had formerly been Hungary. The obvious remedy is to forbid the importation of irredentist maps and books, but not necessarily of all

text-books. One of the minority churches had several schools maps made, using both the Roumanian names and the old Magyar names for towns and villages which had formerly been in Hungary. It should be remembered that some of these villages were entirely Magyar-speaking. These maps were sent up to Bucharest in 1925, as required by law, and permission was given to use them, without reserve. A few months later the Minister of Instruction gave a new order forbidding these maps and permitting only maps with Roumanian names. The church authorities appealed. The minister has given a new order compelling these schools to use in all history and geography courses Roumanian place-names alone, and these are the only courses in which maps are used. The latter order is an evident evasion, since there seems to be no legal basis for prohibiting bi-lingual maps. Schools also are forbidden to use stories of saints connected in any way with Hungarian history.

(e)—*Supervision.* Inspectors of the Department of Instruction visit the minority schools six times a year. In one city the inspector had made a visit to a primary school the week before we came. He said to the principal, as reported to us: "In spite of the right to teach your own language in the first two years, the school will be closed unless the children learn to speak Roumanian. You teach Roumanian in the third and fourth years only." The school has not yet been closed, but its friends are naturally apprehensive. School officials feel that the inspectors usually show an antagonistic spirit, although some inspectors make a great effort to be fair. Their complaints go into such details as that pictures used in teaching are not

Roumanian, that gradings of pupils are not strict enough, that libraries do not have enough books in Roumanian. It is exceedingly questionable whether under the Treaty the state has any right to exercise supervision that goes into matters of detail in minority schools.

When supervisors are suspicious and a church has no initiative in working out its ideas in education there is an inevitable loss of creative enterprise. The state loses as well as the church or the individual. A Roumanian citizen of a minority religion, language, and race said to us: "It is my dream to found among my people a religious school like the Danish folk schools, not concerned either with imparting knowledge or with giving technical training, but interested in developing the intellectual freedom of the individual student. And I am interested in the reconciliation of my people with the majority." This man is a student for the service of the Church. His intention is to atone for some of the wrongs his people, when in power, did to the Roumanian peasants, as well as to better the lot of the peasants of his own race, neglected by its well-to-do. He has no political ax to grind. His scheme is idealistic, and quite possibly practical. Under the school law of Roumania he would not have a ghost of a chance. We call attention to the following about the Danish schools:* "There is no state control; a state inspector visits the school to find out whether it has a minimum of students, and whether it is carrying on a regular program of work. He does not concern himself with what the school is teaching." The Roumanians say: "It is impossible to give them freedom in their schools. They

*J. K. Hart, "Light from the North," N. Y. 1927 (Henry Holt & Co.)

would be irredentist." But repression has never created patriotism. The world has gone far from the Russian idea that patriotism can be instilled by the knout.

The autonomy of the schools also in matters of finance, equipment, and arrangements with teachers has been destroyed under the law of 1925. The authorities of one city are accused by a church of interfering in its taking of a collection for its school. Some pressure is exerted to force the churches to employ teachers with Roumanian diplomas, even in towns where there are no state schools from which a student could obtain one. Under the regulations (21,42) substitute teachers, even those acting in emergency and for a short time, must have fulfilled all the legal requirements, and the penalty is severe. Under the regulations one confessional school after another could be closed if an emergency came. The law also uses the most effective weapon of the obnoxious Apponyi laws which so greatly weakened the Roumanian Orthodox schools in Hungary; it requires the church schools to pay the same salaries as the state schools of the same grade. This has already thrown a heavy financial load on minority groups already overburdened.

(f)—*Enrollment of pupils.* Some of the authorities forbid the confessional schools to enroll pupils of any other denominations. For this there is now no sanction in the law. All authorities forbid the confessional schools which use a minority language to enroll Jews or Armenians or children with foreign-sounding names. A Presbyterian or Roman Catholic Magyar school may not, under heavy penalties, take a child with a German name, in spite of the religious preference of his parents. They cannot take

pupils even from families of their own constituency who have been attending the state schools. Sometimes an unscrupulous school principal takes advantage of this regulation. One instance came to our attention of a principal who delayed to stamp the certificates of the minority school children until after September 10, which is the last day on which pupils may enroll in the minority schools. Regulation 14 requires parents who send their children to church schools to appear between September 1 and September 10 in the state school and obtain a certificate. This regulation has no ground in the law and has already been abused in practice. Regulation 29 requires church school principals to submit their lists of pupils to the state schools, some of whose officials are believed to have tried to force these very pupils out of the church schools. We found people in many villages and cities protesting with tears in their eyes against the action of the authorities during the census in the spring of 1927 whereby they arbitrarily changed the "nationality" or race of families from Hungarian to Roumanian, or from Ukrainian to Roumanian. In a single village more than 200 families were thus made to change their race against their wills. The number throughout Roumania must run into tens of thousands. In the particular village referred to, some protested, and were immediately given heavy fines for having made a fraudulent statement in the first instance by writing themselves down as of a minority nationality instead of as Roumanian.

Coeducation used to be common among the Magyars. The Presbyterian lycées admitted pupils of both sexes. The law forbids this, except in the kindergarten. We

found this to be hardship both to parents and to schools. Since a school must fulfill minimum requirements concerning enrollment, the prohibition of coeducation doubles the number of schools and closes the small ones. Thus the prohibition of coeducation is another weapon against the minority schools. Another result is that the girls in many cases receive no education.

The law has had the effect of curtailing the educational work of the churches in other ways. Their schools cannot remain open in many small places because of the requirement of at least thirty pupils in a primary school. They cannot give extension courses, since under the law such work is in the hands of state schools. This is a hardship for those past school age of a minority language who do not understand Roumanian. The minorities can conduct no normal schools that were not in existence December 1, 1918. They may not found or conduct a university, although they are allowed to retain their theological seminaries.

The regulations for the enforcement of the law were published in February, 1927. They embody the administrative practice, in general, of the last few years. They are, on the whole, harsher than the law itself. For example, under the regulations a denomination has no right to "establish or conduct" schools if a single one of its schools is found to be functioning without authorization. The law says only "establish." This tendency of the regulations holds throughout.

(g)—*Closing minority schools.* For one reason or another, many minority schools have already been closed. The Department can close a school within three months

after two warnings, just as it can remove its "right of publicity." One such warning was issued on the ground that a class-book contained matter written in Magyar; another because a school had enrolled a pupil of the same racial stock but of the Uniat religion; another because the teachers were accused of not being proficient in teaching Roumanian. A lycée was warned for allowing girls to attend its classes according to its old custom since there was no girls' lycée of that denomination near. Another lycée lost its right of publicity on the charge that it had no library, a charge which it denies; and that it took no part in the coronation festival, although it claims to have had seven festivals with 2,000 people present. Another lycée or gymnasium lost its right of publicity in 1924 on the charge that it had kept on its walls a map of the former church bishopric which extended into Hungary, that it had had a Bible class of young people meeting as a club, without a permit; that the Roumanian books in the library were not read enough; and that it taught irredentism, a charge which it denies. This school appealed in January, 1926, to Bucharest for restoration of its right, stating that it had fulfilled all the requirements of the law. A year later the appeal was answered with a brief statement that the school was still regarded as a school without "publicity." After further correspondence an inspector visited the school in May, 1927, and raised the point that salary contracts were not properly signed. In June an order came refusing publicity on still other grounds, that the budget was slightly in arrears, that an "internat" or boarding department had been opened without permit, although the permit had

been requested, that a physical director taught singing, and that several teachers were over sixty years of age. The school received also an intimation that unless it got rid of its old teachers it would be closed entirely. In view of the extremity to which the government has gone to rush immature teachers through its own normal schools, a protest against retaining good teachers because they are sixty seems of questionable justice. One can imagine the position of these teachers, living on small salaries, with the retirement funds of the church practically wiped out, their own savings gone, the people whom they have served too poor to aid them, and the school, one of the oldest Christian educational institutions of Eastern Europe, in danger of being closed.

The Roman Catholic lycée in the same city was closed in 1919, and taken as a state lycée. In Maramaros-Sziget, the Roman Catholic lycée was transformed into a state lycée for girls. The Presbyterian lycée and school of law were both closed. In Timisoara (Temesvar) the Presbyterian lycée, opened in 1917, was closed by the denomination in 1921 largely because of the ruling of the state that Magyars of other denominations, Roman Catholic or Lutheran, could not attend. The Presbyterian lycée at Cluj was closed by the state several years ago on the ground that it had no adequate building, its building having been taken by the government for military purposes. A new building with wide windows, one of the best in the country, was therefore erected. This school has not been able to secure publicity rights yet, however, on the ground that the upper class rooms are not large enough for possible future growth. At Turda

the right of publicity was taken away from the girls' lycée because it had no gymnastical hall. The hall has since been built but the right has not been granted. The Roumanian press has recently attacked the school for building a gymnastical hall. The graduates are not allowed by the state to receive any certificates. Other Roman Catholic lycées or middle schools have been closed by the state, mainly by withdrawing "publicity rights" as follows: 1. Brasov middle school for girls; 2. Deva school of languages, arts, and sciences for girls; 3. Sibiu lycee for boys; 4. Cluj normal school for boys; 5. Hatszeg "grammar" school; 6. Medias normal school; 7. Ditrau lycée, whose building was confiscated; 8. Armenian "grammar" school, on the ground that it must use only Armenian and Roumanian. The pupils, however, knew only Magyar.

Many Magyar primary schools have been closed. The Unitarian church had eighty-six primary schools in 1919; now it has thirty-eight. The Presbyterian church had 491 in 1919, and 385 in 1927. Seven Roman Catholic schools were closed under the pretext that they had no right to exist. (Kezdikovar, Sepsiszentgyorgy, Kezdimartonos, Szentlelek, Devatelepi, Kezdisarfalvi, Kezdirbelafalvi). Three others were closed because the teachers were supposed to be irredentist; four on the ground that the building, though owned by the church, had been erected by the community.

The Presbyterian school in Bucharest, as has been stated, was closed on the ground of irredentism. "Our children go nowhere," said a parent.

It ought to be stated in fairness to Roumania, that a majority, though by no means all, of the primary schools which it closed were new schools opened since December 1, 1918. When Roumania took over the schools owned by the churches but managed by the Hungarian Government, the churches made an effort to recapture education by opening new schools. There is little doubt that a great many of the minority children in places where minority-language schools have been closed, do not attend school at all.

The Ukrainians claim that their schools in Bukovina and Bessarabia suffered most of all. They informed us that in Bessarabia 200 of their private primary schools and several lycées were wiped out in 1923. In Bukovina they claim that ninety-nine primary schools and four lycées were closed by the government—practically the whole Ukrainian-language organization. The Jewish normal school of Chishinau which had had a small subsidy from the state was closed in 1922. Some of the minority schools are ancient, built up by effort and sacrifice through centuries. They are potentially a most valuable possession of the state, but some have already been closed and others are in imminent danger.

6. *The state is charged with forcing state schools on Magyar-speaking communities where there are already church schools.* In many towns and villages, largely or entirely Magyar, where the well-established custom had been to use the confessional schools as community schools, we found charges that the state was forcing the building and maintenance of state schools for Magyar children. This means financial pressure on the people, the existence

of two weak schools instead of one strong one, and pressure from zealous state officials on parents to take children out of the confessional school and enter them in the state school. A Presbyterian pastor complained that he had been forced to send his children to the government school instead of to the church school under threats by the local authorities. The church school was not of his denomination, but he preferred it to the state school.

7. *The "Baccalaureat" law.* The law concerning examinations in the private schools (the so-called "baccalaureat" examinations) was adopted in February, 1925. The examinations are given at the end of the fourth, eighth, and twelfth grades for private schools having "publicity" rights. These examinations have often been conducted with scandalous discrimination against other languages than Roumanian. The examiners are never from the minorities' schools, and usually have little or no knowledge of minority languages. The oral half of of the examination is therefore unusually severe. Also, the subjects are largely Roumanian. The students of minority schools fail in great numbers, not because of poor preparation but because of the language discrimination. The examination last June at Brasov, Alba Julia and Oradia Mare were not only severe, but uneven in their severity. At Brasov the students who took their baccalaureat came from schools well-established and of high standard for a century or more in the surrounding cities. The population is overwhelmingly Saxon or Magyar. In the examination only one of the six subjects was in the mother-tongues. The pupils claim that the passage from Tacitus written on the board was both illegible and de-

fective, and their complaint was reiterated by the Magyar-language press. Great numbers of the Saxon and Magyar pupils failed. One teacher said: "Four times as many Magyars failed as Roumanian-speaking students." At Alba Julia, thirteen Magyar students out of twenty-three were flunked as compared to only three Roumanians out of twenty-eight from one school and only six Roumanians out of twenty-three from a neighboring school. In another city a teacher of an ancient minority lycée of high standing, said about the examination of June, 1927, in which a large proportion of Magyar students failed: "I feel that the students were quite as well prepared as those who passed in other years. The trouble was that they were not sufficiently familiar with the Roumanian language." Fees for these examinations are exorbitant in relation to the incomes of the parents and in view of the heavy taxes and economic depression under which the people live. We were informed that eighty per cent of the state lycée pupils pay no fees for their examinations, and as a result of our inquiry in many places that figure seems quite possible. The Jewish students of Bukovina have complained of discrimination against them in the baccalaureat examinations for several years. The facts were brought out in a protest addressed to the League of Nations, "Nouvelles manifestations d'Antisémitisme en Roumanie," and a reply from the Roumanian League of Nations Association, which admits that following the complaints of Deputy Meyer Ebner the right of being examiner was withdrawn from Professor Braileino. There is a widespread belief that minority pupils are treated with especial severity and that the aim

is to drive them from intellectual fields. At best the conclusion is irresistible that pupils who use another mother-tongue than Roumanian are put at a great disadvantage. The effect of the baccalaureat examinations as at present conducted is both to repress and to Roumanize the Magyar-speaking, German-speaking, and Ukrainian-speaking children, and through them the future generation.

8. *The Angelescu laws and the Apponyi laws.* In 1907 Hungary passed a series of laws known as the Apponyi laws which read in part much like the Angelescu laws of Roumania. "They were drawn", said R. W. Seton-Watson, in his *Racial Problems of Hungary,* p. 233, "upon two radically false assumptions, first that patriots can be created by act of Parliament, and second, that language is the sole basis of nationality. Neither is true." Commenting on the making of Magyar compulsory he says: "To the superficial observer such provisions may not at first sight appear at all unreasonable, and if he discusses the matter with a Magyar friend he will be met with the argument that in Hungary everyone must know 'Hungarian', just as in Italy everyone knows Italian. As a matter of fact one might with equal fairness insist that all natives of India should know the 'Indian', all natives of Switzerland the 'Swiss' language; this is a logical *reductio ad absurdum* of one of the standard arguments in defense of Magyarization." One of the greatest sources of unrest among the Roumanians in Hungary was the fact that their children were being gradually Magyarized. Now the tables have been reversed. The sharpest sections of the Apponyi laws have been repeated

in the Angelescu laws, and some harsher sections added. The *idée fixe* of the Roumanian politician, like that of the Magyar politician of whom Mr. Seton-Watson speaks, is "that patriotism can be forced down millions of unwilling throats, instead of being a moral conception which differs infinitely according to race, environment, and religion." The politicians have forgotten nothing, nor have they learned anything from the Magyar experience.

We believe that there was a genuine idealism in the theory of self-determination which led to the building up of Greater Roumania. The cause of democracy will be harmed if Roumania fails. Therefore Roumania cannot afford to follow old policies and substitute force for justice in the treatment of her minorities. She must justify the idealism which created the greater kingdom.

Chapter VIII

THE CHURCHES

THE Government plans to regulate religious practices.

RECENT governments have allowed the Roumanian minority groups, with the exception of the Baptists and some of the smaller and less established religious groups, to worship once a week. Jews, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, and Unitarians have been allowed to hold regular weekly assemblies at which they may conduct divine services according to their own customs. A Transylvanian Jewish lawyer remarked: "In worship at least, they have left us our freedom," referring to the regular weekly worship of the synagogue. The Jewish synagogue was for a time included in the budget of the Department of Cults and Arts, though in small proportion to the Christian groups. The Presbyterians, Lutherans, Unitarians, and Roman Catholics have until recently shared in subsidies given by the state, along with the Orthodox Church, which is recognized by the constitution as the State Church, and the Uniat Church, which is recognized by the constitution as "preferred." The two latter continue to receive yearly subventions paid from taxes levied on all the people. The state has shown more willingness to consider the desires of the minorities concerning worship than their desires concerning education.

On the other hand, we found a policy in operation and apparently about to be enacted into law, which throttles the creative work of the minority churches and keeps them from becoming progressive forces for righteousness and spirituality. This policy seems to be due to three factors: first, an unreadiness on the part of the Government to consider "institutional" or expressional work as a necessary part of church work; second, ancient racial or religious prejudices; and third, political fear. We found members of minority churches chafing because they were objects of undeserved suspicion, both official and unofficial. Although politics had been put aside and they were trying to live in peace with all men, the common complaint of the people who desired to fulfill their duties as Roumanian citizens was "The State refuses to trust us."

We were informed that two bills, a Religious Minorities Bill and a Religious Practices Bill, drawn up by an earlier Bratianu Government, are about to be revived. These bills, it is expected, will restrict the liberty of the minority churches in all matters except those of worship, namely regulate the letters of Bishops to their churches and all ordinances of the church authorities, allow no church hospitals or deaconesses' homes, and permit no Bible classes or Sunday schools, Church Scout Troops, Young Peoples' Societies or other activities without a specific paper in each case from the administrative officials. This law would give control of the churches to an administrative department, just as the law for private instruction places the confessional schools under the control of the Department of Instruction. The authorities have not yet grasped the western idea of the church as an

institution which, in its directly religious work of building up the Kingdom of God must use many religious committees, clubs, societies, and similar institutions. Our western churches and religious societies, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish alike, have found these indispensable tools. If these bills are enacted into law the present religious activities of the church will undoubtedly be curtailed and made difficult. A prominent minority official said: "The enforcement of the law by the State bureaux has been almost uniformly worse than the letter of the law itself. No leniency is shown in their application of the law." Now that the Angelescu school bill has been put into operation the next step of the Bratianu Government will be to put similar pressure upon the activities of the great religious societies.

Repression of Institutional Work.

Our observation throughout Roumania was that the Government has, in anticipation of these religious practices laws, already sharply repressed the institutional work of the minority churches. Practically every religious congregation in America and Western Europe is carrying on institutional activities that are related to worship but are *extra muros,* outside the sanctuary, and often not on Sundays. To teach religion we use not only Sunday schools, but also week-day classes. The churches find it essential not only to reach the child for worship once a week, but also to conduct expressional and recreational activities through clubs, societies, and sodalities of various kinds. The larger church units maintain philanthropic activities, such as organizations of sisters and deaconesses, hospitals,

orphanages, old people's homes. The Roumanian government has not yet seen fit to allow its churches to minister adequately to its citizens in these modern ways.

In many places the State has not allowed the churches to conduct Sunday schools. Since this is true of villages in diverse parts of the country it is difficult to believe that it is due to local officials alone. In several places the state is now allowing the churches to conduct young people's meeting; in others it has required special permits for each particular meeting. These permits are often both expensive and difficult to obtain.

Choirs are not permitted to meet for rehearsal in many of the smaller places where the gendarmes cannot understand the need for a choir rehearsal. The tyranny of the gendarme in village life is often severe. He is the representative of the government and has remarkable powers. One visitor reports having seen a gendarme attend a service carrying his rifle with bayonet fixed. Committee meetings are usually prevented or hindered. In some cases the churches have had to obtain special permits for a funeral.

Interference with Worship.

At times the Government has gone farther than this and interfered with meetings for worship. In many places Sunday evening services have not been permitted to Presbyterian and Unitarian Churches. In one village the pastor was severely punished for conducting an evening service, the gendarme making a charge of irredentism, which we believe from independent testimony to have been without foundation. He has not been allowed to hold evening service since.

The Ukrainian language groups of the Orthodox Church, which were formerly in Russia, Austria or Hungary, claim to have suffered special interferences. In Bukovina the Austrian Census of 1910 numbers these people 305,000 but the recent Roumanian census only 227,000, at the same time greatly increasing the number of Roumanians. Their priests were accustomed to use the old Slavonic language in the mass, but often read the Old Testament and the Gospel in Ukrainian. Sometimes their sermons were in Ukrainian. In Cernauti (Czernowitz) we were informed that Ukrainian worship had very largely been suppressed, and the Roumanian rite and language instituted in the churches instead.

In Bessarabia, Professor Charles U. Clark says that these people number 254,000; H. F. Armstrong gives the number as 625,000 from the Russian census of 1897; they themselves claim 500,000. Their church in Russian days was undoubtedly used for the Russification of the Roumanians of Bessarabia, and the Russian priests have been called a second line of gendarmes for the State. Many of the peasants are said to have been alienated from the Orthodox Church by the strong Russian nationalist policy of 1871 and the years following, but we found them eager to continue the use of their own language in their church services. Their churches, however, have been incorporated into the Roumanian national church, and most of them are now obliged to use the Roumanian language. We found considerable complaint among Ukrainians of repression of their worship as well as of their other activities. In Chishinau, two of the eight Ukrain-

ian churches are said still to use the Ukrainian language, and they are the only ones which are well attended.

The Adventists are a small group with congregations in Bucharest, Cluj, and other cities. In Bucharest an Adventist pastor was sent to jail for a year for showing in his own house an anti-alcoholism film which was set in Russia and cast reflections on the Russian priest.

The Baptists, who are largely of Ukrainian or of Roumanian speech, many of them first or second generation converts from the Orthodox churches, have been harrassed in their attempts to hold religious meetings, being forbidden even to meet in private houses. They are not allowed to sell Bibles. It is estimated there are more than 200,000 Baptists in Roumania.

The Jewish people, we believe, enjoy in general, freedom to assemble for religious worship, but have been restricted in developing the institutional work of the synagogue. That for the last six years they have been brutally attacked and oppressed by groups of students and others in the anti-Semitic movement led by Professor Cuza, is recorded in another chapter . One hindrance in Jewish religious work is that policy of the state which forbids the rabbis to give religious instruction to children of the Jewish schools in any language but Roumanian or Hebrew. Some families have spoken only the Magyar language for generations. One rabbi said: "I am prevented from teaching religion to the children of our primary school in the only language they understand. It is cruel to children who know only Magyar." Since Roman Catholics, Presbyterians and Unitarians are permitted to give religious instruction in the

language of their choice, it is obviously a discrimination not to allow the same right to those of Jewish faith. Well organized churches with modern programs would be of great value to the Roumanian nation. They would be a power for morality, diligence, civic honesty, public spirit, and true patriotism. An enlightened state will grant to all citizens the fundamental right of freedom to worship God according to their own consciences.

The State has sanctioned efforts to force the state religion on children of minority churches.

In Chishinau we were informed: "In schools of the state the Orthodox religion is compulsory." One reliable informant, whose name is necessarily withheld, said: "In public schools in Chishinau where ninety-nine per cent of the pupils are Jewish, instruction in the Orthodox religion is nevertheless required." We found a widespread impression that the Orthodox Church has allowed itself to be used as a Roumanizing agency by the state.

We find deep resentment of the nation-wide custom of forcing children of minority religions to attend the mass of the Orthodox Church. On national holidays school children are marched to Orthodox Church services, and such attendance has been required during the school year 1926-1927, although the laws of 1925 are silent about it. In one county we were informed that there are six occasions during the year when the children must attend the Orthodox mass. In another county, we were told of two, the other four celebrations being conducted in school. Such occasions are the festival of the Unification of the Nation on May 10, the Ascension Day of

the Orthodox calendar, and the memorial for the heroes of the war.

We found complaints of forcing the children in government orphanages to adopt the Orthodox religion. For example, we were informed that when the Roumanian state took over the Hungarian government orphanages of the Banat, all the children who remained were obliged to become Roumanian Orthodox, while the newcomers are baptized in that church. In one orphanage there are said to be at least sixty-eight Magyar children, nearly all of whom have been baptized according to the Orthodox rite. Formerly, ministers of various denominations were admitted into the institutions to give religious instruction. Now only the priests of the Orthodox Church have this privilege. We were informed of at least five orphanages where such conditions hold.

The ministers of minority religions have sometimes found what seem to be unreasonable difficulties in ministering to those soldiers in the army who belong to their particular faith.

We call the attention of the Orthodox Church to these conditions and earnestly urge the consideration of methods by which the religious rights of the minorities may be maintained.

The Minorities Are Heavily Burdened to Pay for the Construction of Orthodox Church Buildings

With the creation of Greater Roumania the Eastern Orthodox Church has come into a new realization of its power. The church, which for centuries so valiantly defended the rights of the Christian peoples against the

Turk and gained freedom from Turkish domination only fifty years ago, is stirred by a consciousness of importance and opportunity which the new situation gives it.

Unfortunately this sense of power has at times been diverted from spiritual purposes to selfish ones. The church has derived from the State added prestige and particular privileges. In no way is the new political vigor of the Orthodox Church more clearly shown than in its remarkable campaign for building expansion. All over Transylvania we saw new buildings, many of them in the process of erection this summer, frequently in splendid and conspicuous sites. This expansion would be laudable if the land had not often been taken from tracts allotted for park purposes, if the construction costs had not been forced on people of other denominations, and if the building program had been confined to districts where the members of the Orthodox Church were sufficient to warrant it. We found in Cic, in Cluj, and in the Banat new buildings whose magnificent domes dominate cities, the population of which has for centuries belonged largely to other denominations. While it is customary in Transylvania for each city to give aid for new church buildings, we found a great many people who felt that the aid given the state church was altogether out of proportion to its membership in these cities. The grievances, in brief, seem to be as follows: 1. That a disproportionate number of building sites has been allotted from public land to the Orthodox Church. 2. That a disproportionate amount of taxes has been used for Orthodox buildings and likewise a far too small amount for the buildings of minority churches. (In one city, peopled

almost entirely by the minorities, one of the minority churches had been voted property for a new building by the city council in 1917 and again in 1922. Each time the motion was vetoed by the Prefect and the property was finally turned over to private persons. In another city "without a single Orthodox permanent resident they have expropriated land for the Orthodox Church and Roumanian culture halls.") 3. That land allotted for public parks has been taken for Orthodox buildings. We found evidence of this in at least two places. 4. That agricultural lands have been allotted the Orthodox Church for the support of its work in disproportionately large amounts.

Because of the strong political position of the Orthodox Church this building program is often forced upon unwilling givers by state officials, either through taxes or popular subscriptions. We were told of a man who refused to contribute; as a result his taxes were tripled. In the final analysis pressure of this kind can do nothing but bring discredit to the Christian religion and to the church which should be the first to disapprove it. Nothing so quickly arouses antagonism as charging expenditures for religious purposes to those peoples whose convictions are unsympathetic to them.

Agrarian Laws Have Been Unevenly Enforced Against the Minority Churches

The agrarian reform in general was not only a step in an ideal direction but was necessary for political purposes. In the enforcement of the agrarian laws the government has in many cases shown a very commendable willingness

to study the minority situation. Yet we found that the minorities carry, and with some justice, a sense of grievance as to the way in which it was applied to the churches. The German Lutheran Church in Transylvania lost 3,500 acres (jugars) of landed estate without receiving any compensation. After a time, 600 acres of woodland and 100 acres of land were returned for the expenses of the Bishop's office. The Roman Catholic Status lost 19,291 acres; of the 4,709 acres left them, 4,647 were forest land. Thus the land confiscated constituted the endowment of seven lycées. The government also took 7,436 acres from the small Roman Catholic parishes, leaving 119 parishes and seventy-one mission stations with no land This is in spite of the legal requirement that sixty-six acres be allotted to each parish. The Presbyterian and Unitarian Churches of Transylvania and the Banat lost similarly. For example, in one city in the Banat, the Presbyterian Church lost thirty-five of its sixty acres, an endowment given to the church fifty years ago by a Protestant family. In some instances the Hungarian Lutherans received grants of land for their churches where there had been none before, but many of their churches have much less than the legal amount and less than the Orthodox Church which is generally believed to have received large amounts of land. We could find no traces of land having been allotted to the Jewish religious communities. Many persons informed us that there were no cases of allotment to Jewish synagogues. Towns in which there had been national interferences in the local disposition of the land to the churches, include Brasov, Chichis, Miercurea, Cive, Odor-

hei, Béla Hazu. We recommend that the allotment to the churches be fairly distributed and that the synagogues be given the same rights as the churches.

The Government Has Sometimes Confiscated Church Property Apart From the Land

In addition to agricultural land, we found the minorities complaining that in a number of cases other property had been taken from them. We were told that in Brasov a house had been taken from one of the minority churches, in Targul Secuese a cemetery, in Törcsvar a church, in Zalau a manse, in Alsoporumbak a church building, in Kudszir a church, at Nagyszeben an orphanage, and in Valko a church residence.

Subvention for Church Purposes

20860

For several years the state provided subventions or subsidies to the minority churches. The Averescu government included in its budget for 1927 appropriations for the Magyar-language churches as well as for the Orthodox Church. This followed the custom of the Hungarian state, under which the Magyar-language churches had formerly existed. These subventions were pointed to with pride by government officials as an instance of fair dealing with the minorities.

However, the Bratianu government which took office just before the elections of last July has reduced the subventions to what seems to be merely a nominal amount. Cable dispatches in October stated that in order to make up an alleged deficit in the treasury the subventions to minority churches had been reduced from

$672,000 to $420,000 (70,000,000 lei), and that this amount would not, according to expectations, be paid in full. The subventions for the Orthodox Church, which is the state church, and for the Uniat Church, noted in the constitution as a preferred church, apparently stand, for $672,000 was the amount to be paid under the budget of 1927 to the minority groups, Presbyterian, Unitarian, Lutheran, Roman Catholic, Moslem, and Jewish. We are informed that the subventions to be paid to the minorities may even be omitted altogether. It is difficult to reconcile this action with Article 9 of the treaty, which says: "Roumanian nationals who belong to racial, religious, or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and fact as the other Roumanian nationals."

In the July elections of 1927 the Bratianu party entered into an agreement with the Union of Roumanian Jews by which it received the support of Jewish voters all over the country. It is creditably reported to have made the following promises in return for this support: 1. That it would help the Jewish people to organize the Kehillah. 2. That it would give subventions for the Kehillah. 3. That it would support the request of the Jewish primary schools for the coveted right of "publicity," meaning the right to give their own examinations. 4. That it would give a subvention for the Jewish lycée. 5. That it would fight the anti-Semitic movement in the universities and elsewhere. The American people will watch with great interest for the fulfillment of these promises of the Bratianu government.

The Averescu budget of 1927 which has just been reduced, was however unfair to the Jewish element. It gave only 400,000 lei, ($2,400)—one-half leu per capita —to the Jewish group, as compared with 664,000,000 lei, (about three and a half million dollars), or over forty lei per capita, to the Orthodox Church.

The State Has Interfered With the Training of Church Workers

Our attention was called to the unfair condition in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in the city of Cluj, an ancient college founded several hundred years ago. In several of the professors' apartments Roumanian officers are still quartered even after eight years of occupation.

In the same seminary, the students are crowded, seven in a room, because part of the building has been taken for the state railroad administration.

Deaconesses' training schools have not been permitted by the government.

Our impression is that these conditions are not known to responsible Roumanians, and that many state officials, if informed, would take steps to end them.

Difficulties About Representation and Administration

While every Orthodox bishop is allowed a seat in the Senate, the law allows only one Roman Catholic bishop, one Presbyterian bishop, and one German Lutheran bishop a seat there. The Baptists, who claim to have more than 200,000 followers, have no recognition at all. The Unitarians, with 75,000 people have no representa-

tion whatever, because of the requirement that a communion must have at least 200,000 members to be thus represented. The Hungarian-speaking Lutheran Church with headquarters at Arad has no representation. The group claims twenty-two congregations with 27,682 people, seven filial congregations with 1,149 people, 3,008 people in places without congregations, twenty-one ministers, fifty assistant ministers, twenty-one organists, and thirty-two confessional schools. It has not, as yet, had the privilege of separate organization, its administration being joined by the government to the German-speaking Lutheran Church. We respectfully urge that the Minister of Cults hold a conference with this denomination with a view to the establishment of an independent Hungarian Lutheran Status.

Roman Catholic grievances have been the subject of conversations between a representative of the Vatican and the Roumanian government. The bishoprics have been cut across by the present national boundaries of Roumania and need immediate adjustment. We urge that the Roman Catholic Church be given the opportunity of rearranging the boundaries of its bishoprics to conform to the national boundaries.

Violence

The following statement in the German language was received during our stay in Roumania: "Up to the present time the Baptists have not succeeded in securing civil marriage in some of the districts of Bukovina. Some of the Baptists have been fighting for five or six years to obtain it but without success. The priest refuses to

deliver the necessary documents, in this way forcing the people to remain in the Orthodox Church. Also, the Baptists are prevented from holding their services. Worshippers are often surprised by the gendarme on their way to and from services, are arrested, put in prison and mal-treated in a most disgraceful way, no distinction being made between men, women or children. In one case a Baptist preacher in Bessarabia was beaten until he bled and then imprisoned with his wife and two children. Another preacher was condemned to seven months' imprisonment for preaching. In many villages the prayer-houses are closed at present so that the Baptists of these villages have no opportunity for holding service. Often the Baptists who have gathered together are surprised by gendarmes and dragged before military courts and sometimes chained like dangerous criminals. In the district of Cernauti (Czernowitz) a gendarme came into the house of a Baptist and removed with his weapon the motto on the wall, saying that such things were not allowed in Roumania. The protests and petitions of the Baptists to the authorities against such violations of justice are always without result. Therefore, the Baptists of Bukovina and those of the other states of Royal Roumania, without distinction of nationality, turn to the parliaments and peoples of the world and beg them to do their utmost that the Baptists of Roumania may be afforded freedom in the exercise of their religion and equal civil rights with other citizens of the State."

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, we were informed that in December, 1926, a group of Baptists were driven by gendarmes into the river in winter in Secureni.

The gendarmes guilty of such violence were disciplined very slightly by a three day sentence, but were not even dropped from the service. The cause of greatest difficulty seems to be the harsh action of the courts martial. The civil courts, we were told, acquit Baptists brought before them. The prejudice against the Baptists may be partly racial, since some of them are Ukrainian; but on the other hand many are Roumanian. Another reason may be that they have drawn many followers in the last few years from the other communions, especially from the Orthodox Church. In a land where church and state are closely allied, some citizens of slight education might readily think of people abandoning the state church as unpatriotic. The Baptists, however, keep entirely clear of politics.

The worst instances of violence are the frequent and dastardly attacks upon Jewish people which are the subject of a separate chapter.

From the standpoint of the friends of Roumania, it is deplorable that there should be any evidence whatever that the government participates in religious persecution. We feel that religious persecution is even more destructive in its effects upon the State Church than it is upon the denomination persecuted. Under the constitution, the citizens of Roumania have the right to choose their own religion. The people who desire to belong to Jewish, Baptist, Adventist, or other denominations and to worship God according to their own consciences should be granted full religious and civil liberty.

The attitude of the Orthodox Church towards violence against the Jews was expressed by the Patriarch of Rou-

mania, head of the national church, in an interview in his palace June 16. He said in part: "The Jewish problem is primarily economic. The anti-Semitic movement is directed against the exploiters. Our people immediately after the war were very poor and were exploited by the Jews, many of whom made a great deal of money during the war. The Jews have done many evil things in this country. They are a disturbing element, disobedient to the Prime Minister, the Patriarch, and the King." Anti-Semitism uses two contradictory economic arguments to support itself, on the one hand that the Jew is an exploiter, and on the other that the Jew is so poor as to be a financial burden to the country and because of his poverty prone to support radical movements. Either charge is possibly true of some individuals in any religious group in Roumania.

Chapter IX

CONCLUSIONS

THE deputation is unanimous in its opinion that the question of the treatment of the Minorities in Roumania constitutes one of the most serious problems with which its statesmen and citizens generally will have to deal.

Roumania has an unequalled opportunity to face courageously a complex situation and to attempt the solution of a problem which, while perplexing, is yet capable of a peaceful solution. Roumania can go far toward solving the question if she wills to do so. When she signed the Minorities Treaty she assumed the obligation, as a member of the family of nations, to deal justly with all the minorities within her borders.

The American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities has had occasion to study the situation in Roumania from time to time, and your deputation has taken into consideration all former reports made and the replies of the Roumanian Government, and in addition has had access to other reports, such as those to the League of Nations, and the various replies of the Roumanian Government. Besides this it has studied with care histories recently written of Roumania, and documents now being circulated through its Propaganda Department. In view of all the circumstances, while we believe that there has been some improvement in the condition of affairs and that the Minorities are being treated with more justice than heretofore, we are also convinced that

a considerable body of public opinion in Roumania will support nothing less than the granting to the Minorities of those rights guaranteed by the Treaties and considered by all civilized nations as the minimum requisite for an independent existence of a free people.

The Commission is of the opinion that there remains a wide discrepancy between the Constitution adopted by the State which is liberal in many respects, and its enforcement through the officials, particularly noticeable in the administration in the outlying districts.

What has been said of the Constitution can also be said of the laws relating to civil liberties. The courts have been in many instances, some notorious, either intimidated or deliberately used by groups for their own ends. The Codreanu and Totu murders, involving the killing of a police officer while in the performance of his duties, and the shooting of an innocent Jewish student, are two conspicuous examples. Enlightened public opinion will continue to look with disfavor on the administration of the laws of any country where defenceless peoples find it safer to court arrest than to take their chances on the public streets. That this situation has developed in a number of instances in regard to the Jews is proved by the evidence submitted to the Commission.

The Commission deeply sympathizes with the desire of Roumania to raise the status of its own people that they may have part in the future guidance of its affairs and in the administration of its laws. The system of education formulated is in many regards excellent, especially for citizens of Roumanian speech and race. We believe that the makers of these laws and those respon-

sible for their administration have failed to give sufficient weight to the fact that loyalty cannot be achieved by force. Patriotism is instilled by benefits conferred and not by outward compulsion. Every failure to enact school laws equitable to the minorities, and every failure to administer them fairly, is a grievous error on the part of a great nation endeavoring to use rightly elements which might be built into a loyal citizenship. The attempt to Roumanize the minority groups by force and to destroy their confessional schools, managed for centuries by their churches, will, if persisted in, undoubtedly deprive Roumania of the confidence also of people abroad who would otherwise be her friends. Therefore we believe that if Roumania cares to put herself in a good position in the eyes of the rest of the world, she will permit the minorities to have the sort of schools to which they are accustomed, grant them a reasonable autonomy, and give them the full right to teach the historic languages of their respective peoples as well as the Roumanian tongue. Supervision over them should be reduced to a point where, while efficient teaching freed of irridentism is secured, the officials will not handicap these schools in their work. At present the amount of official correspondence is so great that the government offices are obviously overburdened, and the minorities do not receive replies regarding vital matters sometimes for as long a period as a year after their letters have been sent. The minority schools especially should be given some stability for the future and relieved from the perpetual fear that they may be unfairly closed. The splendid old Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Unitarian, and Jewish institu-

tions, many of them two hundred or three hundred years old, might well be looked on as an asset instead of a menace to the nation. We call the attention of the leaders of the Eastern Orthodox Church to the fact that, contrary to the understanding of some of them, the subsidies promised the minority schools have not been given.

Many of the Roumanian school officials, where a difference of opinion arises in promulgating a new order or administering a law, adopt an unconciliatory attitude. We are satisfied that these officials could, by conference with minority groups, alleviate a great deal of the misunderstanding which otherwise has been and will continue to be a cause of bitterness.

The Commission calls attention to the administration by the Roumanian officials of the citizenship laws. There is no doubt that the fundamental right of citizenship is denied to thousands who are justly entitled to it. Thus they are arbitrarily deprived of those safeguards accorded by every nation to its nationals and this in spite of solemn guarantees to the minorities.

The Commission found, during its visit, that a hideous campaign of intimidation and brutality was being carried on against the Jewish citizens of the state, its motive being a mixture of arrogant intolerance and ignorant hatred. It is true that there is not now as much terrorism as formerly. The improvement is due to three causes: first, the systematic campaign carried on for several years against the Jews has so intimidated them that they absent themselves in large part from the universities and public life; second, the virulence of the campaign has reacted unfavorably on Roumanian prestige abroad;

third, the promises of the Liberal Party to certain groups of Jewish voters in the summer of 1927 have brought some cessation of anti-Semitic excesses. We rejoice in this step taken by the party now in control of the government, and trust that what is now only a temporary party move may become an accepted and sanctioned governmental policy.

Without going into detail about the causes of violence preceding and during the election of July 7, 1927 (which was generally believed to be a crying scandal in Roumania), we must point out the serious danger to the peace of Europe in the repression of the franchise rights of minorities and groups outside the administration.

The Commission was impressed with the native intelligence, industry, kindly disposition and friendliness of the Roumanian people, especially evident among the peasants in the villages. Greater Roumania obviously seeks to find her place among the more forward-looking nations of the world. In view of these facts, which are amply supported by the evidence of all travellers and those best informed, it is extremely unfortunate that the state church should have sanctioned the National-Christian Defence League and the National Roumanian Christian Students' Union, whose program and publications are a disgrace to our civilization, an insult to the name of Christian, and a black blot on the fair name of Roumania. We think it most unfortunate that students for the priesthood of the state church should have taken part in demonstrations against fellow citizens of other religious preference or racial background, on the basis of racial or religious prejudice. We courteously,

and, at the same time, urgently call the attention of the Roumanian state church to the situation and in the name of our common Christianity urge that it purge itself of all anti-Semitism and bitterness towards people in Roumania of other racial stocks. We point out the danger of allowing the students in its theological schools to continue their agitation against Roumanian citizens of Jewish and other racial origins, either in the Regat or in the annexed territories. The hope for the future of Roumania and the peaceful solution of its problems will vanish for another generation unless the churches and schools contribute to their settlement, which can be secured only by tolerance towards all races and languages.

There has never been in Roumania what has come to be technically known as a "pogrom;" that is, a massacre inspired and sanctioned by the state. There have been excesses, acts of terrorism and such molestation of peaceful elements of the population as to cause continual fear and unrest and generally to reflect badly upon those who are responsible for the peace and welfare of the country. There is, moreover, grave danger in allowing the youth in the universities and schools to conduct anti-Semitic agitations. Even worse is the complacency with which many people regard the attitude of certain professors and teachers in the schools and universities towards these movements, not only condoning, but even encouraging them. The students who develop in the atmosphere of anti-Semitic bitterness will be the citizens and the teachers of tomorrow, and will pay less attention to the pogrom-less record of their country than their predecessors have done. We believe that this bitterness is not

representative of the enlightened opinion of the great body of university professors and school teachers of Roumania; nevertheless it has been accepted with far too much complacency by the educated citizenship and leadership of the nation.

It is our opinion that certain officials of the Government have made a great mistake in forbidding thousands of individuals, who belong to the minority groups, to maintain their status, and in registering as Roumanians those who for some time have spoken other languages. The Commission is satisfied that the Roumanian Government could with great profit to itself study the facts relating to the census and the methods by which it was taken. We are convinced that many of these complaints which seem to us justified can easily be righted.

The Commission was satisfied that the violence of which the Baptists and other groups complain is actual and constituted a charge of religious persecution and therefore endangers the highest interests of the State Church, and the prestige of the nation. We urge the officials of the church, with the government authorities, to work out some plan by which these people may be granted full religious and civil liberties.

We call the attention of the Government to the situation of the Hungarian-speaking Lutheran churches and urge that a legal status satisfactory to them be established.

We call the attention of the Government to the situation of the Roman Catholic minorities particularly in the Banat, the western borders, and Bukovina and urge that a speedy and satisfactory settlement of the relations be-

tween the Government and the Roman Catholic Church be made. The consequences of delay here will intensify the feelings based as they are on the recognized international claim of the church and its servants.

The attention of the State Church is called to many cases of apparent unfairness to the minority churches in the distribution of land under the agrarian laws, to the confiscations of church buildings and property of the minority Communions; to the proposed laws restricting minority churches; to the present practice of obliging members of minority churches to contribute to the cost of the new buildings of the State Church and to grant public park sites in regions where the Orthodox Church is itself a minority. We urge this powerful church in the interest of Christian fellowship and goodwill to use its good offices in bringing together those who feel they have complaints and the government authorities, in order that a solution may be found.

The Commission discovered a feeling of wide-spread resentment among the members of the minority churches against the compulsion exercised by the government enforcing them and their children to attend the services of the State Church on patriotic occasions. The Commission believes that the churches and the Roumanian Government can work out a plan whereby the feelings of members of minority churches will not be violated.

Finally, the Commission was impressed by the fact that there are in the annexed territories of Greater Roumania great resources of educated citizenship from which the Roumanian Government could draw with great profit for the service of the State. Many of these citizens at

the present time find themselves in despair at what seems to be a studied, determined effort on the part of the majority to discriminate against them in the filling of official positions.

APPENDIX

RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN ROUMANIA

APPENDIX

THROUGH FRENCH EYES

Report of the French Delegate,
PASTOR JULES JEZEQUEL

I visited the greater part of Roumania as a member of a Commission sent by the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities, to study the situation of religious minorities, and particularly the Jewish minorities of that country. I toured the old Kingdom and the provinces of Bessarabia and Transylvania, annexed to it after the war, from the 15th of June to the 10th of July, by railroad and automobile so that I might see the country and the towns.

Preliminary Remarks

After such a short and hasty journey, it would be presumption on my part to pretend to know Roumania, great as she now is. The great, difficult and delicate problem, which is commonly called the problem of minorities, also requires several months of persevering study.

I do not flatter myself that I saw and heard everything, but I did discuss the question with more than a hundred persons from many different walks in life. I can say with certainty that all who have conducted like investigations will agree that I am only reporting evidence and facts that would catch the eye of any impartial observer, and which would impress them with unquestionable force.

Nevertheless, before making public the results of our inquiry as to the present status of religious minorities in Roumania, it is important to make several reservations.

It would be very unjust to judge the affairs of this country solely from an occidental viewpoint. If Roumania does not care to be characterized as Balkan, she must recognize the fact that she is oriental. Now the conception of truth in the Orient is not identically the same as that in the Occident. Although this fact must be stated, it is only fair to say that the Roumanians are not responsible for this difference in conception. It may be explained historically, recalling for instance, that Roumania was subject during centuries to the Turkish yoke, that she has only just achieved her full political autonomy. But all explanations which might be made would not eliminate but would serve only to emphasize this difference in conception. Another reservation should also be made. If there are religious minorities in Roumania the fault is not hers. She is not responsible, or if she is to be held responsible, it would be to her credit; showing her to be an hospitable and tolerant country. But she is not responsible in the critical sense of the word, for 800,000 Jews have come and settled themselves in her land. In times past Roumania's strong neighbor, Hungary, took from her and colonized Transylvania, where there were strong Roman Catholic and Protestant Minorities. After the war this province was justly restored to Roumania and the Minorities automatically became an element of Roumania. This accounts for the minorities problem which Roumania now faces. She has not yet discovered how to control that problem. The solution is hard to find. And it is a particularly difficult question for Roumania on account of her social constitution.

The Roumanian population may be divided into two categories—very sharply defined. On the one hand the peasantry, which comprises nearly the whole of the population. This is an uninformed and uneducated mass: eighty per cent of the men and ninety-five per cent of the women know neither how to write nor how to read. All were serfs only a few years ago. The political rights, which have been given to them, have not yet given them the spirit of free citizens: moreover, these rights are rather more theoretical than effective. The Roumanian peasant appears gentle, tolerant, hardworking, but ignorance makes him the victim of superstition and fear. Since the war he has acquired the right to possess land and the expropriation of great land-owners has put into his hands a part of the national soil. Emancipation will doubtless come later through this great reform, but for the moment it has not uprooted the peasant from his century-old servitude.

Besides this peasantry, there is another small class, which really should itself be divided into two parts. One part is made up of small officials, the police and the administrators of the large and small villages. This part of the second class is very close to the peasantry, only differing in that it holds some power. The other part is composed of great land-owners, high officials, governors and members of the liberal professions. This last category forms really an "elite." Highly cultured, it is intellectually, and socially very far removed from the peasantry. It is this "elite" that the Occident is most familiar with.

How unfair it would be to judge all Roumania by this last class, and how unwise it would be to ask it to apply,

purely and simply, the rules which govern English, American or French minorities, to the minorities of Roumania! A nation which has no public opinion, in which nearly the whole population is unable to understand its duties and its rights, which is nothing but a mob and a herd, has need of a centralized, strong, if not dictatorial government, to prevent the country falling into anarchy. This necessity is all the stronger for the reason that only a river separates Roumania from the country of the Bolshevists.

Here is a nation, full of promise, of which splendid development may be expected, but which is still an *infant* nation, trying its first uncertain steps on a new and unknown path. Circumstances over which it had no control have thrust upon it the problem of minorities—one of the most perplexing and inextricable post-war problems.

Here another and new aspect should be taken into consideration. I was concerned only with the question of religious minorities, but the question of nationality is so so closely interwoven with that of religion that it is well nigh impossible to distinguish one from the other. When one sees the Transylvanian Roman Catholic and Protestant minorities united most cordially for the defence of their religious rights, one realizes perfectly that this unity would not be so complete if these minorities were not of the same nationality. I am not criticizing them, but this is simply one of those explanatory remarks that one feels bound to make at every turn in an investigation of this kind. For, in this oriental Europe, facts are so complex, so confused, and deeply rooted in an obscure past, that it

is impossible to pass judgment simply on one of them and remain just and impartial. These facts must be minutely analyzed each time and must be placed in their historical or geographical frame. No estimate should be made without certain qualifications. Under these conditions every study takes on infinite proportions. It is not practicable at this moment to study this question of nationality. A realization, however, of the complexity of the affairs of the Orient serves to remind one that no judgment, having any bearing on this question can have absolute value, but must in many respects be very relative. I hope that the significance of this remark will be borne in mind in its relation to what follows.

It is important not to under-rate any of the difficulties of the problem which Roumania has to solve. There are few countries in which this problem has arisen which have arrived at a satisfactory solution. Therefore it must not be counted a crime because Roumania has not been able to do what others, faced with less perplexing conditions, have not been able to do.

It must not, however, be thought that I am unsympathetic with Roumania, but taking all these reservations into account, I feel obliged to say that Roumania has not shown herself adroit in her manner of solving her problem of Minorities. Supposing she *has* attempted to solve it, it seems to me that she has attempted to solve it in the manner in which Alexander the Great cut the Gordian Knot. This does not appear to have been a good way.

The Jewish Problem

Let us consider first, the attitude of the Roumanian Government toward the Jewish minorities. I say—the

Roumanian Government. This distinction between Roumania and her Government suggests another necessary remark. One must remember never to confuse the Roumanian people with its Government. This distinction may be easily understood in view of what has been said above about the necessary division of the Roumanian population. The people are there, but they are there inert, passive, without either opinion or will, and taking no part in the direction of affairs. It may be said: but the Roumanian constitution is democratic. It gives franchise to every Roumanian citizen. True. The constitution of Roumania is indeed very liberal. It is one of the best and broadest in the modern world. Its Article 5 stipulates that "all Roumanians without distinction of race, language, or religion, shall enjoy the same liberty of conscience, instruction, press, right of assembly, of association, and of all liberties and rights established by the laws." It is admirable. A people possessing such a constitution might be supposed to have a large part in the direction of its national affairs. In reality, it is nothing; nothing but a scrap of paper. The constitution exists, unquestionably, but it is not applied. I saw with my own eyes, for example, that the political elections are a mere formality. They are managed by the party in power and for its profit. Although the opposing parties exist, they have no liberty. The "citizens" are conducted to the ballot boxes like a herd and drop in the ballot which the official authorities have handed them. Or more simply, the police vote for them. At times they vote with so much zeal, (if without intelligence) that they give the party which is in power a stronger majority than it desires.

Everything is arranged by the party chief, who divides the offices and favors. The people have nothing to do with it.

Let us recognize the fact that it cannot be otherwise. This uneducated peasant people, (uneducated, not because they are not capable of being educated, but because they are not given the means), has no opinion in political matters. Moulded by a servitude out of which they have only just emerged, or to put it more exactly, out of which they have not yet emerged, they can only obey orders. Could the governing body transform these ignorant peasants into an enlightened electorate in a day if it wanted to? Nor is it certain this body really seriously desires such a transformation. Whatever may be the case, the governing body takes the popular will for what it is, that is to say for nothing, and acts accordingly. Practically, it could not act differently. (One cannot help regretting that it adjusts itself so easily to such an entirely unsatisfactory condition of affairs.) In any case, this throws the whole responsibility for the conduct of public affairs on the Government. This statement accounts for the distinction drawn above and leaves one to deal only with the attitude of the Government, or, at least, with the attitude of the small class in which it originates and for which it governs.

Now I must repeat that the result of our investigation of the acts of the Roumanian Government, particularly as they concern the Jews, does not show the Government up in a favorable light. A great deal has been said about anti-Semitism in Roumania. If one were to believe certain press reports, the situation of the Jews in that coun-

try is intolerable because of all sorts of cruelty to which they are subjected. The words "persecution" and "pogroms" have even been used. I wish to say immediately that I found nothing as serious as that.

There is nevertheless a certain anti-Semitism in Roumania, a sort of extreme anti-Semitism which sometimes manifests itself in very regrettable violence. This anti-Semitism is in no way the act of the Roumanian peasants, who easily adapt themselves to the presence of the Jews. It is not even the act of the educated class, which as a whole condemns it. The Government is not strictly speaking anti-Semitic, but it tolerates the anti-Semitic manifestations of a small group of Roumanians, and it has a narrow and irritating policy toward the Jews which seems to be actuated by a spirit of anti-Semitism.

This anti-Semitism is particularly noticeable in the matter of public instruction. It may also be found in the attitude taken by the Government as to the concession of political rights to the Jews. The above mentioned Constitution accords rights of citizenship to every inhabitant, Jew or otherwise, who has resided from a certain fixed date in any portion of Roumanian territory. Roumanians by extraction have had no difficulty in obtaining recognition of their nationality. But the same is not true of Jews, even those whose parents and grandparents already resided in the provinces which came back to the mother country. In Bukovina, particularly, thousands of Jews have not been able to obtain recognition as citizens. They labor under a grave disadvantage by this act, for they find themselves put outside the law and are citizens of no country. To justify this state of affairs,

the Government replies that a large number of the Jews from Bukovina are suspected Bolshevik refugees and that their case must be dealt with with great circumspection, lest undesirable elements should enter the country. That is possible. But years have passed and the miserable conditions of these unhappy persons has not improved. And when one takes in account the fact that this ostracism applies only to Jews, or above all to Jews, one is inclined to regard it as an anti-Semitic manifestation.

Anti-Semitic feeling, moreover, although constitutionally forbidden, practically bars Jews from entering public office or attaining the higher ranks in the army. In reality, and with rare exceptions, commerce alone is open to them. In latter years, a few have been able to become lawyers and doctors. The magistracy and teaching professions are closed to them. And this, because they are Jews.

But it is above all in the matter of public instruction that anti-Semitism is manifest. Here we touch on a very delicate question and one in which it is very difficult to keep a clear vision. Public instruction in Roumania is in the hands of the State. Primary, secondary, and higher education is entirely dispensed by the State. Such a system should not present great difficulties. But this State instruction is not lay. The Orthodox religion is officially taught in the schools and colleges. Here is the first and most serious obstacle. It can be readily understood that un-Orthodox families cannot bring themselves to allow their children to receive religious instruction which is not their own. The Government asserts that un-Orthodox pupils are not obliged to follow the Orthodox religious

courses. I believe, however, in the face of many complaints and recriminations on this point, that this assertion is perfectly gratuitous. It may well be that here and there Jewish pupils have been granted a dispensation from attending religious courses, but such dispensations cost them so much irritation and vexation that they have been obliged to leave the school. From my own observation it was perfectly evident that actually only Roumanian and and Orthodox pupils attend the public schools.

It is not enough for Jewish parents that their children do *not have to* receive Orthodox instruction. They insist quite legitimately that they ought to be taught the tenets of their own religion in the public schools. But the Government replies that this complaint is not valid because the Jews are at liberty to establish their own private schools.

In the towns in which they are numerous, particularly in Bessarabia and Bukovina, the Jews have established many private schools. But at what sacrifice and at what price? Visit these schools and talk with their directors and professors and learn the facts. In spite of the Constitution, these establishments are subjected to a capricious and arbitrary regime. Authority for teaching is only given for one year: it must be renewed each year: it may always be refused for reasons which the Government is never at a loss to find. In spite of official affirmations to the contrary, these private schools never seem to receive any subsidy from the State. This is contrary to the stipulations of the Treaty on Religious Minorities. And that is not all. A law dated December 22, 1925, closed all the Jewish normal schools. All efforts to repeal this law

have been ineffectual. Thus, the Jewish private schools are seriously hampered. They are doomed to a very short life through being unable to find the teaching personnel necessary to their existence.

The Jewish secondary schools have been closed. If Jewish families decide to send their children to the State High schools they are confronted with the "numerus clausus" (closed number) law, which certainly is not in the Constitution, but which has nevertheless been constantly applied since 1922.

But a much more serious condition exists as regards the higher education. Here it is not a question of a more or less insidious anti-Semitism, it is organized violence. Outrages and brutalities have persisted in these institutes of learning. The various Roumanian universities, particularly that of Jasi, have at times been the theatre of bloody scenes, of which the Jews have been the constant victims. These anti-Jewish movements began at Cluj, (Transylvania) in December 1922. The motive, it is true, which actuated them, has value in the discussion. The Orthodox medical students complained of being hampered in their studies because they were not supplied with a sufficient number of cadavers for dissection. Now all cadavers placed at their disposal were the cadavers of Christians, the religious law of the Jews standing in the way of Jewish cadavers being brought to the amphitheatre. Nevertheless, the numerous Jewish medical students practised dissection on Christian cadavers. The other students protested and summoned the Jews to either work on the cadavers of their co-religionist, or to go.

That is the alleged motive for the trouble which persists in all the universities. There is something unquestionably just in the protests of the Christian medical students, but one cannot but feel that this motive is only a pretext. Besides, the partisans of Professor Cuza, organizer of the avowed anti-Semitic movement, proclaim the fact publicly that it is really against the Jews that they are working and for the sole reason that they are Jews. Our people, they have told me, are a peasant people, poor and ignorant. These peasants naturally live in the country. This hands the towns over to the Jews and permits them to invade the banks and to take possession of commerce and industry. We saw the danger of our country being led and exploited by the Jews, strangers who hate us, and whose race are sowers of ruin and anarchy. This is a mortal danger to our country. We have notified the Government of the danger, but it has not moved in the matter. We have appealed to the intellectuals, to the "elite." We have met with only silence and inertia on their part. Therefore, seeing that no one will act for the good of the country,we have taken the only course which remained to us, that of violence. We do not pretend to solve the question in that way, but to establish it a fact. It has been so established, and brutally. During the years 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926 and 1927, with or without pretext, disturbances have not ceased in the universities of Roumania, which have had to be closed several times.

Without any provocation on their part, Jewish students have been insulted and beaten unmercifully. The authorities have not tried, or have tried only feebly, to stop these

outrages. Nevertheless these have gone sometimes as far as murder. On the 24th day of October, 1925, an anti-Semitic student, Cordeli Cordeanu, shot and killed the prefect of Jasi and his two agents on the pretext that he had allowed his agents to beat students who were making a demonstration. This officer was not a Jew, but he was not showing sufficient admiration for the anti-Semitic methods. His murderer instantly assumed the part of a hero. After several hearings had been put off and and after several changes of tribunal, the accused was brought to trial. He was triumphantly acquitted and then sent to France with a Government subsidy. No lawyer had dared to plead the cause of the widow of the prefect, who had brought a civil suit. Only M. Costa Faron, a great citizen, and not a lawyer, tried to make the voice of justice heard. He was made the victim of odious aggression. When this defenceless old man of seventy was in the buffet of the station awaiting the departure of a train for Bucharest, he was set upon by some twenty students and savagely beaten.

One can readily understand that it was then impossible for the Jews to remain in the universities. Of course, the Constitution did not close the doors against them. It may even be that the names of some Jews are entered on the university registries. But the fact is that there are few Jewish students in the Roumanian universities. They go and study outside the country.

Here again, the responsibility for this state of affairs must be placed on the Government. The students are not all anti-Semitic. Of the 30,000 who attend the vari-

ous universities, hardly a fifth are partisans of Professor Cuza.

It would have been very easy for the Government to suppress and to stop these disturbances. Particularly since everything is possible for the Government in Roumania. It did not suppress them. It tolerated all the the assaults against Jewish students. This, in spite of the fact, that the members of the various governments who have held office since 1922 were not, with but a few exceptions, personally anti-Semitic. But the Government is in the habit of making use of the students when it wishes to create a diversion. In therefore tolerates all their acts. As for the anti-Semitic students, it is naturally easier for them to get rid of intelligent and hard-working fellowstudents by violence than to surpass them in examinations. They complain that the vital forces of the country are in the hands of the Jews. Why do they not fit themselves to occupy these strategic positions. Why do they not become bankers, doctors, lawyers, industrial leaders and merchants, and the Jewish question would be truly and loyally settled. But the Roumanian intellectuals have a very pronounced tendency to believe that all positions and honors are theirs by right of birth.

Minorities in Transylvania

If we pass now to the consideration of other minorities we will find ourselves faced with a totally different situation, but one just as complex and delicate.

The victory of Roumania's allies brought her several vast provinces which really belonged to her, for their population was undoubtedly in a large majority,

Roumanian. Transylvania, one of these provinces, was part of Hungary before the war. She had been colonized by her conqueror who had established himself firmly. Important German groups had also established themselves in certain parts of Transylvania. Of the five million inhabitants of Transylvania, when she was given back to Roumania, 57.50% were Roumanians, 25.53% Magyars and Szeklars, 10.45% were Germans (Saxon and Swabs). There were also 3.60% Jews, 2.92% Ruthenians, Serbs, Bulgarians, etc. This made a very mixed population, as far as race was concerned, and not less so from the viewpoint of religion.

The Roumanians are Greek Orthodox; the Hungarians are Roman Catholics numbering about a million, Protestants, divided into Reformed, more than 700,000, and Unitarians about 74,000. Those of the population who are Germans by extraction, but have become Hungarian subjects, are Lutherans, numbering 260,000 . To these about 200,000 Jews should be added. Relations between the Government of old Roumania and the Orthodox Roumanians of Transylvania were easily established. In the meantime, a Transylvanian peasant party has been formed which is not always in harmony with the Central Government. Serious difficulties however, are not likely to occur on this hand. But the relations with the Magyar, the Germans, and the Jews, were at once found to be very intricate.

Of the Jews, I will say nothing. The lot of the Jews of Transylvania is that of the Jews of the rest of Roumania. Of the Germans, there is not much to say, as they are treated in the same way as the Magyars, and

when I speak of the Magyars I am also speaking of the Germans. It should however, be noted that the authorities are perhaps a little less severe with the latter than with the other minorities. This is perhaps because they have behind them Germany, a more imposing power than Hungary. It is quite natural that the Magyar minorities are the most disturbing element the Roumanian Government has to deal with. They were torn from their country by force. This force, it is true, was that of justice. It was right that a province, in which the large majority was Roumanian, should be returned to Roumania. But this justice was none the less hard for the Magyars of Transylvania. It was naturally very sad for them to be torn from their mother country. They are in this way, it is said, expiating an old sin. But because a sin was committed far back in the past, one can hardly hold the present Transylvanian Magyars responsible, and one cannot hold a grudge against them for not rallying with enthusiasm and without regret to the new regime.

On the other hand, one cannot hold it against the Roumanian Government for regarding these newcomers with some mistrust. The situation is one of great delicacy. The Roumanians are in the majority in Translyvania, but these Roumanians are peasants. Their ancient masters left them systematically, one might say, in total ignorance. It is true that in old Roumania the directing class did not trouble itself to teach the miserable peasant. But this statement is not an excuse for the Magyars, however much they pride themselves on a superior civilization to their neighbors. Established in the towns, when

they were not in their chateaux, the Magyars of Transylvania, great landowners, officials, industrials and merchants reigned for their own profit alone.

Now, by a sudden turn of affairs, the disdained and despised Roumanian peasants take precedence over the superb Magyar. It is the Roumanian who has become master. The Magyar must bow before the uneducated and rough Roumanian gendarme. It is perfectly comprehensible that this gendarme, and the government for whom he acts, cannot wholeheartedly believe in the loyalty of these enforced Roumanians. Mistrusting their loyalty, and moreover, annoyed by the deep-rooted as well as irritating habits of these people, the Government has taken a distrustful and vexatious attitude toward the Magyars.

The different Hungarian religious denominations deeply resent this feeling. They have raised bitter complaints. Their lamentations are not, properly speaking, about ecclesiastical questions alone. They include also questions of instruction and of property. On these two questions they are most bitter.

The Central Government in matters ecclesiastical has respected things as it found them, equally for Roman Catholics, as for Protestants. But the Greek Orthodox Church is the church of the State. Other churches are only tolerated. All the Orthodox archbishops and bishops have a constitutional right to sit in Parliament, but only one Catholic bishop has been admitted. But that is only a small inconvenience. The essential point is that liberty of creed should be respected. And it seems that it is so respected. The Churches, provided they con-

fine themselves strictly to their religious functions, seem to have all the liberty that they can legitimately expect.

This however, does not mean that the religious minorities do not suffer from the new regime. From the first they were hit, and often hard hit, by the agrarian reform. Before the annexation, they possessed vast lands, whose revenues contributed to their maintenance. I believe that with the old regime, certain churches enjoyed bigger revenues than their needs demanded, but today it is certain that their revenues are insufficient. In many cases they did not have anything left because the expropriation laws were applied to them without mercy.

Have they the right to complain? The principle of expropriation was just. The peasant who cultivated the land, in the old Roumania, as well as in the new, did not possess a bit of ground. It was all in the hands of the great landowners, of the officials and of the Churches. To avoid a threatened peasant-uprising after the war, the Government took over the lands for distribution to the peasants. It was right in so far as principle was concerned. But the application was not always so. The State took into consideration itself and its friends, but it struck heavily at those whom it considered its enemies—namely, Magyar land-owners, and the Churches of the minorities. As far as the latter were concerned, the blow was particularly heavy, as it also struck the church schools. Now in Hungary, all the schools are church schools. They were equally so in Transylvania. Thus in a day these schools lost the most valuable of their resources. And the churches, impoverished themselves, had so much less for the support of their schools. And

they needed more than ever, because in these schools alone could suitable religious instruction be given in their own language. Another example of the complexity of Roumanian affairs! The Churches and the schools, left to their own devices, are thrown back on themselves, and for better or worse have become centers of Hungarian culture. Hotbeds of "Irredentism," says the Government.

Would it not have been wiser on the Government's part to have become the protector of these churches and schools? It has not thought so. It has preferred to adopt an antagonistic attitude.

It has tolerated the creation and functioning of private church schools, but has surrounded them with a meddling supervision. It has subjected them to annoyances and vexation. For example: no Roumanian child is allowed to attend a private church school. If any official discovers in one of these schools, a child whose name has a Roumanian sound, even though it is proved to him over and over again that the child is a Magyar or German by extraction, the child has to leave his school to go to the Roumanian public school where the Orthodox religion is taught. And it is only by good fortune that the private school he has left is not closed. I was told with such sincerity of an instance of this kind that I was obliged o believe it. A Roman Catholic orphanage had taken in Roumanian children afflicted with ophthalmia, for treatment. It had imprudently accepted for the care of these children, a subsidy from the Government which thereupon took the opportunity of taking over the orphanage. I gathered evidence of a number of acts of this sort. I can-

not guarantee that they are all true, but they are too numerous not to be significant.

Here is another instance of hardship. It is asserted that the secondary church schools, of which many are very important, have not the right to give graduating diplomas to the universities. The Government denies this. What is true, and this possibly explains the contrary statements of both parties, is that pupils, in order to acquire diplomas, have to pass examination before professors, who belong to the Department of Public Instruction, and are appointed for this purpose by the State. It is true, this system is not illiberal in itself. It can be justified with good reason. The minorities are wrong to complain of it. But, if, as they assert in all seriousness, the authorities profit by the system to disqualify as a foregone conclusion, the candidates drawn from the church schools, then the minorities have a right to protest.

These lamentations and recriminations are not voiced by just this or that minority. This fact in itself gives them additional weight. All agree in denouncing the bad spirit of the Government toward them. The harmony between Roman Catholics and Unitarians, which I observed everywhere in Transylvania, would not be so close if they did not both suffer from the same vexations and annoyances. If these annoyances affected individuals only, it would be a small matter, but they affect the most cherished convictions and most essential principles of the minorities. It is not surprising that after treatment of this kind these minorities are rebellious and restless, and that they do not always strive for an adjustment which should be their special work.

Conclusions

After conducting an exhaustive investigation for four weeks among the most authoritative Jews, among the anti-Semites, the Catholic and Protestant Minorities, among members of the Government, Orthodox clergy, among believers and free thinkers, I am convinced that all is not well in the greater part of Roumania. No matter what the officials of this country say, there is a minorities question and it is a very dangerous and disquieting question for the future of the nation. Certainly, the minorities are not numerically so strong that the Government need fear them, but they nevertheless form an important element of the population and it is important that they should not remain a foreign body. If assimilation does not take place, the health of the nation will be seriously menaced.

This assimilation will not take place unless each party contributes a great deal of good will. Good will is a primary and indispensible ingredient. But that alone will not suffice. Jews, Catholics, Protestants and the Government must understand that they each must undergo a serious self-examination. They must ask themselves if they have not a certain state of mind or habit or prejudice which militates against the desired assimilation. To begin with, the Jews cannot hope to enjoy all the rights of Roumanian citizens and still refuse ever to become real citizens. They are perfectly justified in demanding respect for their religious convictions and the free use of their own language, but as soon as these rights are assured, they should not refuse to allow themselves to be assimilated. Now it seems to me, that to

many of the Jews, Roumania is only a country of temporary residence. They should choose either to become Roumanians—it being understood that the Government should lend itself to this assimilation and make it possible—or they should go and found a Jewish State somewhere else. That is more easily said than done, I know. But the best solution of the Jewish question, both for the Jews and the Government, seems to me to be a loyal assimilation. Roumania would find what she stands so badly in need of at the present—a middle class.

As for the Christian Minorities, the question, although it has a different aspect, is not any easier to solve. Here again the solution demands good will on both sides. It is evident that the Government regards these minorities with deep distrust, not because they are Christian, but because they are Hungarians. These minorities cannot help being Hungarian, and they have not had to forget it. Perhaps they do not want to forget it. But their treatment by the Government is not likely to make them forget it. How shall this dead-lock be broken? Time must be taken into account. Time will smooth the way. But the minorities have also something to do. And I am certain they are willing to do it. Even those that remain Hungarian at heart, are beginning to bow before an accomplished fact, and expect to become loyal Roumanian citizens. It will be easier for the next generation to accept the fact, and the problem will solve itself. This will happen if there is an abandonment on the one hand, of an obstinate policy of vexation and annoyance which keeps the minorities in a state of irritation and hatred, and on the other hand, the abandonment of a cult

of customs and traditions in which "Irredentism" will find a fertile soil.

But above all, the Government must apply itself to the solution of the minorities question and to making Roumania a homogenous nation. I have said much of the Central Government. There is no other authority in Roumania and therefore none other is responsible. But I do not wish my thought to be misunderstood. I do not mean to say that each individual member of the Government is responsible for the anti-Semitic policy or for the antagonistic attitude toward the Christian Minorities which I have had to denounce. I know, on the contrary, that the majority of them deplore this policy because they know how fatal it is to the best interests of their country. But they themselves are not free. They are bound by old traditions. For past centuries, violence and brutality have been the instruments of Roumanian Government. Whoever holds a position of authority thinks he should be arrogant and imperious. Now the time has passed when superiors could beat their inferiors with impunity. The high officials are beginning to understand this, and undoubtedly many of them prefer to use methods worthier of the democratic liberty for which Roumania will stand. But the smaller officials are still inclined to use the old methods of brutality. When one sees it close at hand, one sees that there is much more occasion for blaming these methods than for denouncing anti-Semitism and the systematic persecution of minorities. The administration is bad, not only because it is unintelligent, annoying and violent, but also because it is a field for bribery in which this practice

flourishes abundantly. In a country where too often liberty is theoretic,the officials are strongly tempted to follow this regrettable practice. And because they have not yet the high civic pride which would protect them against this temptation, they yield to it. A practice which is a great misfortune for the masses.

But Roumania has an upper class capable of acting against these bad political customs. It is for that class to set itself resolutely to that task. The task is indeed a difficult one. The Government, all governments, must learn that order is not achieved by violence, authority is not born of brutality. A Government cannot be selfish, or bloody revolution will follow. A Government must not be blind, haphazard, following the course of events. Above all a Government cannot function by means of lies and craft. It is only by the force of established right, by far-sightedness, by wisdom, that a nation can be led. Solutions of problems by means of the policies of the past are only empty solutions. To preside over the lives of peoples requires work, vision and courage to guide them into lands of justice and liberty. Roumania is not without men endowed with these virtues. Let these men disfranchise themselves from out-of-date prejudices and dare to arouse themselves to action and their country will know a glorious destiny. And they have a force at hand which ought to help them. The Orthodox Church has preserved a profound influence over the people. She is its heart and soul. She can become its teacher and spirit. But she also must uproot herself from pernicious habits. She must enlarge her point of view and vivify her methods, not draw in upon herself through fear of strange

influences. Tolerant by tradition, democratic in constitution, she is ready to be the re-animation and the inspiration of the new Roumania. She is ready for a spiritual and intellectual awakening. May she have the audacity and intelligence to accomplish it. She will save the people in saving herself.

However, since I have no thought of giving advice, but simply intend to set down some reflections, there is one last one which I set down here because it seems to suggest itself. The occidental nations, and amongst them I include the United States, proud of their development and their progress, ought not to abandon their weaker sisters of oriental Europe. If these have not kept step in the march of civilization, the occidental nations are in a large measure responsible. They have not known how, or they have not cared, to hold out a helping hand when the need was there. It is imperative for them to adopt another attitude. Let them give their moral and material support to peoples too long despised. It will mean an assured future for these peoples. It will be for the health of Europe. For, it is very certain that Europe will not be able to resist the dangers which are gathering around her, unless she becomes a united and harmonious Europe where no nation will want to enslave another but where each will help the other so that all may attain to liberating Progress.

20860

DATE DUE

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN DR265.R6 1928
Roumania : ten years after
3 0645 0003 9128 0